

TRINITY COLLEGE LIBRARY



3 1761 02741783 1



129118

DEC 1 5 1988

Colonial & Continental Church Society.

9 Serjeants' Inn, Fleet St., London, E.C.

Patron—HIS MAJESTY THE KING.

Vice-Patrons—THE ARCHBISHOPS OF CANTERBURY, YORK,
ARMAGH, DUBLIN, &c.

Secretary—THE REV. J. D. MULLINS, M.A.

SEEKS to send the means of grace to our own country-
men in the Colonies, in other parts of the Empire, in
the ports and manufacturing towns of the Continent, and
elsewhere.

Vast tracts of North-west Canada are being opened up
rapidly, and are **without Clergy or services.**

In Australia extensive bush districts are **becoming Pagan**
from sheer lack of any messengers of the Gospel.

Many Colonial Bishops are now appealing to the C.C.C.S.
for **MORE HELP** than it can give.

Forty-eight Colonial Dioceses are aided by the C.C.C.S.
It has 38 permanent Chaplaincies on the Continent of Europe,
and arranges (self-supporting) services for English people in
about 100 Continental health resorts.

Subscribers may appropriate their Contributions as they
wish.

There is a **SPECIAL FUND FOR NORTH-WEST
CANADA.**



Magazine: The 'Greater Britain Messenger.'
1d. monthly.

TWO POPULAR HOTELS in CENTRAL LONDON

Near the British Museum.

KINGSLEY HOTEL

Hart Street, Bloomsbury Square, London.

Opposite the British Museum.

THACKERAY HOTEL

Great Russell Street, London.

These large and well-appointed TEMPERANCE HOTELS have

Passenger Lifts. Electric Light throughout. Spacious Dining, Drawing, Reading,
Fireproof Floors. Bathrooms on every Floor. Writing, Billiard, and Smoking
Perfect Sanitation. Telephone. Night Porters. Rooms, Lounges. Heated throughout.

BEDROOMS, including attendance, from 3s. 6d. to 6s. Full Tariff and
Testimonials on Application. Inclusive Charge for Bedroom, Attendance,
Table d'Hôte Breakfast and Dinner, from 8s. 6d. to 10s. 6d. per day.

*Telegraphic Addresses :—Kingsley Hotel, 'BOOKCRAFT, LONDON.'
Thackeray Hotel, 'THACKERAY, LONDON.'*

THE PUREST TABLE WATER
SPARKLING

PURALIS

DISTILLED. BRISK. PURE,
THE BEST AND CHEAPEST.

The LANCET says:—'No purer or more trustworthy beverage
could be produced.'

PRICES:

3/- two dozen champagne pints. 3/- one dozen syphons.

Free Delivery in London and Suburbs.

Send a Postcard for name of nearest Agent to

THE PURE WATER CO., Ltd.,
Queen's Road, Battersea Park, LONDON, S.W.

PROTECTION FROM FIRE

BRYANT & MAY'S

SPECIAL



PATENT

SAFETY MATCHES

HAVE SECURED

32 Awards for Excellence

WORKS:—

LONDON AND LIVERPOOL

MESSRS. BELL'S BOOKS

Crown 8vo, 3s. 6d. net.

THE GOSPEL OF PAIN.

By THOMAS J. HARDY.

'Any book dealing with the perpetual mystery of suffering is bound to find an audience, and Mr. Hardy's work thoroughly deserves attention from all, either orthodox or sceptical. His position is Christian, and he deals with his problem in a fresh and encouraging manner, and in a spirit not over-confident, nor too timid. He is frank and forcible in dealing with the modern preachers and teachers who would make of our Lord "a mere example"; he can state in plain language for the untheological what is the outcome of a revived Arianism. The volume is a notable contribution to modern religious writing.'—*Pall Mall Gazette*.

Prospectus on application.

Printed on India Paper. Limp cloth, 6s. net.

NOVUM TESTAMENTUM GRAECE.

Edited, with Various Readings, Parallel Passages, &c., by F. H. A. SCRIVENER, M.A., D.C.L., LL.D. Fourth Edition. Revised and Corrected by Prof. Dr. E. B. NESTLE. Also issued in limp leather, 7s. 6d. net; or interleaved with writing-paper, limp leather, 10s. 6d. net.

'Which is the best student's edition of the Greek New Testament? Scrivener's. Some of us were taught to use it first at college, since when we have used no other. . . . This will now be to some of us our Greek Testament till the end come.'—*Expository Times*.

A Prospectus, with Specimen Pages, will be sent on application.

A Soldier in Christ's Army. An explanation of Confirmation and the Catechism for Public Schoolboys. By A. C. CHAMPNEYS, M.A., formerly a House Master at Marlborough College. Fcap. 8vo, 1s. 6d. net.

'The teaching is homely, direct, and well adapted to the mind of the Public Schoolboy, and often it is illustrated by apt allusions.'—*Church Times*.

The Food of Christ's Soldiers. The Holy Communion, with Prayers for Preparation and other Occasions, and an Appendix, mainly Historical. By A. C. CHAMPNEYS, M.A. Fcap. 8vo, 2s. net.

'Boys and young men in all ranks of life will find much to uplift them in these common-sense and spiritual pages.'—*School Guardian*.

Works by the Rev. M. F. SADLER.

Detailed List sent on Application.

The Church Commentary on the New Testament.

With Notes, Critical and Practical, Introductions and Excursuses. In Twelve Volumes. Crown 8vo, 4s. 6d. each Volume.

'It is far the best practical Commentary that we know, being plain-spoken, fearless, and definite. . . . For solid Church teaching it stands unrivalled.'—*Church Quarterly*.

Uniform with 'The Church Commentary.'

Sermon Outlines for the Clergy and Lay Preachers.

321 Outlines, arranged according to the Church's Year. Third Edition. Crown 8vo, 5s.

Church Doctrine—Bible Truth. Nineteenth Edition. Fcap. 8vo, 2s.

The Church Teacher's Manual of Christian Instruction. Being the Church Catechism Expanded and Explained in Question and Answer, for the use of Clergymen, Parents, and Teachers. Forty-eighth Thousand. Fcap. 8vo, 2s.

Confirmation. An Extract. 1d.

The Communicant's Manual. Being a Book of Self-Examination, Prayer, Praise, and Thanksgiving. 32mo. 128th Thousand. 1s. 6d. A CHEAP EDITION for distribution, 8d.

LONDON: GEORGE BELL & SONS, YORK HOUSE, PORTUGAL STREET, W.C.

BEMROSE AND SONS' LIST.



The Official Report of the Church Congress, Manchester, October, 1908,

Will contain the Sermons and Papers in full, and Reports of all the Speeches, revised by the Speakers.

Demy 8vo. Price to Subscribers—Paper covers, 7s.; cloth, 8s.; half calf, 10s. 6d. post free.

THE LAST FORMED SEE OF THE ANGLICAN CHURCH.

THE CATHEDRAL CHURCH AND SEE OF ESSEX. By the Rev. J. CHARLES COX, LL.D., F.S.A.

This book, written by that well-known Ecclesiologist and Antiquary, contains an outline story of the founding of Christianity in the Kingdom of the East Saxons in the Seventh Century, and pursues the history of the Church in Essex up to the completion of the scheme for an Essex Bishopric in 1908, with the selection of Chelmsford as the Cathedral Church.

Crown 8vo, with many illustrations. Paper covers, 1s. 6d. net; cloth gilt, 2s. net; postage 2d. extra.

BAPTISM ON DIDACHÉ; or Scriptural Studies on Baptisms, especially Christian Baptism. By PHILALETHES. This treatise is on the Doctrine of Baptisms, and especially on that of Christian Baptism in its Catholic or Universal Aspect. 534 pages, royal 8vo, cloth, price 7s. 6d. net; post free 8s.

'So far as we can remember, there has never before been written so full an account of what Baptism is and what it leads to.'—*Expository Times*.

THE STEEP ASCENT. Memorials of ARTHUR HEBER THOMAS, and Records of the Ramnad Mission S.P.G., 1532-1906. By F. J. F. T. Together with a Prefatory Note by the Hon. Mrs. GELL. Large Crown 8vo, cloth, with many illustrations, price 5s. net; post free, 5s. 4d.

'The story of young Thomas's life should prove an inspiring influence to many of his countrymen.' *Daily Telegraph*.

PROBLEMS OF CHURCH WORK. By the Rev. Canon J. DENTON THOMPSON, M.A., Rector of Birmingham. Crown 8vo, cloth, 3s. 6d. net; post free 3s. 10d.

'Our readers, both clerical and lay, should get it for themselves and read it in the sympathetic spirit in which it is written.'—*Record*.

MOST INTERESTING TO MISSIONARY CHURCHMEN.

THE INDIAN CHRISTIANS OF ST. THOMAS, commonly called the Syrian Christians of Malabar. A Sketch of their history and present position. By the Rev. W. J. RICHARDS, D.D. (many years Missionary to the Hindus in Travancore and Cochin). With Preface by EUGENE STOCK. Crown 8vo, with many illustrations. Cloth 2s. 6d. net; post free 2s. 8d.

'Their history is of much interest, and it is concisely told here by a high authority.'—*Times*.

CHURCH REGISTERS AND FORMS.

Churchwarden's Account Book. 10s. 6d.

Register of Services. 6s. 6d.

Clergyman's Ready Reference Register. 8s. 6d.

Combined Register of Preachers, Offertory and Communicants. 2s. 6d.

Preacher's Book. 5s. 6d.

Confirmation Register. 3s. 6d.

Communicant's Register. 3s. 6d.

Baptisms and Burials Registers. 12s. each.

Banns Book. 5s.

Church Door Notices. Nos. 1 and 2, 2s. 6d. per set of 52; No. 3, 9 in. x 6 in., 2s. per 100.

Service Tables (Choir Notices), eight varieties, 1s. 6d. per 100.

Offertory Forms, seven varieties, 1s. 6d. per 100.

Offertory Books. 3s.

Certificate of Banns, Baptisms, Marriage, and Burial. Books of 25, 1s. 3d.

Prayers for the Sick. Card, 1s. per doz.

Baptism Cards. 1s. 3d. per doz.

Confirmation Cards. 4s. per doz.

FULL PARTICULARS ON APPLICATION.

London: BEMROSE & SONS, Ltd., 4 Snow Hill, E.C.; and Derby.

CHARING + HOSPITAL,

AGAR STREET, STRAND, W.C.

SUPPORTED BY VOLUNTARY CONTRIBUTIONS,
ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTIONS,
DONATIONS,
LEGACIES.

Cost of Maintenance, **£50** a day.

24,000 Sick and Injured Persons treated annually.

WALTER ALVEY, Secretary.

EYRE & SPOTTISWOODE,

Government and General Booksellers.

TO meet the convenience of customers, and to prevent any delay in supply, we accept **deposits of large or small sums**, varying according to the probable extent of orders—we undertaking to despatch on day of issue copies of:—

**ACTS OF PARLIAMENT,
BLUE BOOKS, PARLIAMENTARY PAPERS, AND
STATIONERY OFFICE PUBLICATIONS,**

RELATING TO
ANY SELECTED SUBJECT.

Messrs. EYRE & SPOTTISWOODE beg to announce that they are the owners of Acts of Parliament (Public, Local, and Private), up to and including the year 1886, and also stock those of later date. They also hold a considerable stock of valuable Parliamentary Papers.

LONDON: EAST HARDING STREET, E.C.

Branch Office: 2 VICTORIA STREET, S.W.

SIR ISAAC PITMAN & SONS, LTD., PUBLISHERS.

NEW WORKS IN THEOLOGY.

THE CHURCH IN MODERN ENGLAND. Being a Study in Ecclesiastical Politics. By the Rev. F. CLAUDE KEMPSON, M.B. In Crown 8vo, cloth gilt, gilt top, 2s. 6d. net.

THE FUTURE LIFE AND MODERN DIFFICULTIES. By the same Author. In crown 8vo, cloth gilt, gilt top, with diagrams, 3s. 6d. net. 'A very able and forcible book.'—*Tablet*.

LIBERAL THEOLOGY AND THE GROUND OF FAITH. Essays towards a conservative restatement of apologetic. By HAKLUYT EGERTON. In crown 8vo, cloth gilt, 3s. 6d. net.

THE RELIGION AND WORSHIP OF THE SYNAGOGUE. An Introduction to the Study of Judaism from the New Testament Period. By the Rev. W. O. E. OESTERLEY, D.D., and the Rev. G. H. BOX, M.A. In demy 8vo, cloth gilt, 10s. 6d. net. With 8 illustrations.

THE EVOLUTION OF THE MESSIANIC IDEA. A Study in Comparative Religions. By the Rev. W. O. E. OESTERLEY, D.D. In crown 8vo, cloth gilt, gilt top, 3s. 6d. net. 'Stimulating, earnest, frank and full of interesting information.'—*Athenæum*.

MODERNISM. A Record and Review. By the Rev. A. LESLIE LILLEY, M.A. In demy 8vo, cloth gilt, 6s. net. 'For those who have only lately begun to take an interest in the liberal movement in the Roman Church, and who are ignorant of its previous literature, this book will be invaluable.'—*Church Times*.

By the Right Rev. COSMO GORDON LANG, D.D., Bishop of Stepney. Crown 8vo, 6s. each.

SOME THOUGHTS ON THE MIRACLES OF JESUS.
SOME THOUGHTS ON THE PARABLES OF JESUS.

For other Theological Books write for Catalogue [N] to

No. 1 AMEN CORNER, PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON, E.C.

WILD'S

LONDON.

First-class Temperance Hotels,

30 to 40 LUDGATE HILL, E.C.

Telegrams: Wild's Hotels, London.

ELECTRIC LIFT.

Telephone No.: 4695 Holborn.

CENTRAL FOR
CHARING CROSS,
CANNON STREET,
AND HOLBORN
VIADUCT STATIONS
FOR
THE CONTINENT.

NEAR TO THE LAW
COURTS.

CLOSE TO THE
CHURCH
MISSIONARY
SOCIETY OFFICES.



Also at 70 and 71 EUSTON SQUARE.

Handy for Early and Late Trains. Night Porter.
Close to Euston, Midland, and Great Northern Stations.

HOME COMFORTS.

CLEANLINESS AND QUIET.

Both Hotels central for Business or Pleasure.

INDEX TO ADVERTISEMENTS.

	PAGE
Additional Curates Society	<i>Inside of front cover</i>
Adeney & Son	<i>Inside of back cover</i>
Bell, George, & Sons	2
Bemrose & Sons, Ltd.	3
Bryant & May, Ltd., Matches	1
Charing Cross Hospital	4
Central Church Committee for Church Defence and Instruction	} <i>Facing inside end cover</i>
Church House Corporation	
Colonial and Continental Church Society	<i>Facing inside front cover</i>
Curates' Augmentation Fund	<i>Facing inside end cover</i>
Eyre & Spottiswoode	4
King's College	<i>Facing end of text</i>
Kingsley Hotel	<i>Coloured paper in front</i>
London College of Divinity	vi
Missions to Seamen	ii
Mowbray, A. R., & Co., Ltd.	vi
Orphan Working School and Alexandra Orphanage	ii
Oxford University Press	8
Pitman, Sir Isaac, & Sons, Ltd.	5
Poor Clergy Relief Corporation	6
Pure Water Co., Ltd.	<i>Coloured paper in front</i>
Thackeray Hotel	<i>Coloured paper in front</i>
Wild's Temperance Hotels	5
Wippell, J., & Co., Ltd	<i>Back page</i>

THE POOR CLERGY RELIEF CORPORATION.

Established 1856.

Incorporated by Royal Charter, 1867.

38 TAVISTOCK PLACE, TAVISTOCK SQUARE, LONDON, W.C.

President: The BISHOP OF LONDON.

THIS CORPORATION gives immediate assistance in money and clothing to the poorer Clergy of England, Wales, Ireland and the Colonies, their Widows and Orphan Daughters, in times of sickness, bereavement, or other temporary distress.

The Committee meet twice in each month, to consider the cases brought before them, and to make grants. They are guided solely in their decision by the **Want and Worth** of the Applicant.

The Corporation has, to May, 1908, aided more than 27,000 cases of clerical distress, with grants ranging from £5 to £75, in addition to gifts of clothing, blankets, and other household requisites.

Secretary: MANDEVILLE B. PHILLIPS.

HELP IS EARNESTLY ASKED

The
Corporation of the Church House,
 DEAN'S YARD, WESTMINSTER, S.W.

President :

HIS GRACE THE LORD ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY.

Vice-Presidents :

THE RIGHT HON. THE EARL EGERTON OF TATTON.

THE RIGHT HON. AND RIGHT REV. THE LORD BISHOP OF
 LONDON.

The Church House is the Central Business House of the Church of England and the other Churches in communion with her.

In it **Convocation** and the **House of Laymen** for the Province of Canterbury hold their Sessions, and the **Representative Church Council** also sits here. **Forty-seven Church Societies** have their offices in the Buildings, and **over 600 meetings** are held **annually** in the Halls and Committee Rooms.

There is a valuable **Library** and **Reading Room** furnished with Church Papers from all over the world.

Members of the Corporation have the **privilege of taking books out of the Library**, they have the use of the public rooms, and they can have their letters addressed to the Church House and forwarded as may be desired.

CONDITIONS OF MEMBERSHIP.

Membership of the Corporation may be acquired by persons of either sex (being Members of the Church of England or of any Church in full communion therewith) by an Annual Subscription of at least One Guinea ; Life Membership by a Donation in one sum of at least Ten Guineas. Associates are admitted on the payment of Five Shillings a year on the recommendation of a Member.

THE COUNCIL APPEAL FOR FUNDS for the
 completion of the **Permanent Buildings.**

SYDNEY W. FLAMANK, Secretary.

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

An Annotated Psalter.

Arranged by J. M. THOMPSON. Fcap 8vo. 2s.

The Book of Job in the Revised Version.

Edited, with introduction and brief annotations, by S. R. DRIVER. Crown 8vo, 2s. 6d. net.

The Parallel Psalter.

Being the Prayer-Book version of the Psalms and a new version arranged on opposite pages, with an introduction and glossaries by S. R. DRIVER. Second edition. Extra fcap 8vo. 3s. 6d. net.

Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Book of Genesis.

By G. J. SPURRELL. Second edition. Crown 8vo. 12s. 6d.

A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament.

With an Appendix containing the Biblical Aramaic, based on the Thesaurus and Lexicon of GESENIUS, by F. BROWN, S. R. DRIVER, and C. A. BRIGGS. Small 4to. 34s. net. The several Parts can be supplied to complete sets.

The Parson's Handbook.

By the Rev. PERCY DEARMER, M.A. Sixth edition, revised a second time, with much Additional Matter, and with Thirty-one Illustrations. Crown 8vo, cloth, gilt top, pp. xxii + 562. Price 6s. net.

This volume contains practical directions, both for parsons and others, as to the management of the Parish Church, and its Services according to the English use, as set forth in the Book of Common Prayer, with an Introductory Essay on Conformity to the Church of England.

SOME PRESS OPINIONS

Church Times.—‘The book is in fact, indispensable, and ought to be made official.’

Pall Mall Gazette.—‘Mr. Dearmer has done yeoman work in bringing English ritual back to lines of English common sense. We love beauty in workmanship, but let it always be English, and not Italian or other. In his last book Mr. Dearmer will help many a clergyman who wishes to have his church and its surroundings decent and in order. Wheresoever a critic would find fault the appeal is generally to sound and sturdy sense.’

Birmingham Daily Post.—‘The continued demand for Mr. Percy Dearmer’s “Parson’s Handbook,” is an unmistakable proof of its usefulness as a guide to the conduct of Divine service in the Church of England. . . . Of great value both to students of ecclesiology and to those faced with the practical problems of the management of a church and its services.’

Sheffield Daily Telegraph.—‘The book is packed with information, and even those who dislike an ornate ritual will find it useful.’

OF ALL BOOKSELLERS

LONDON: HENRY FROWDE, OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS, AMEN CORNER, E.C.

PAN-ANGLICAN CONGRESS

1908

VOLUME II. SECTION A

THE CHURCH

AND

HUMAN SOCIETY

SPEECHES AND DISCUSSIONS

TOGETHER WITH THE PAPERS PUBLISHED FOR
THE CONSIDERATION OF THE CONGRESS

LONDON

SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE

NORTHUMBERLAND AVENUE, W.C.; 43, QUEEN VICTORIA STREET, E.C.

BRIGHTON: 129, NORTH STREET

NEW YORK: E. S. GORHAM

1908

The Missions to Seamen.

FOUNDED 1856.

Patron:

HIS MAJESTY THE KING.

Vice-Patrons:

H.R.H.

THE PRINCE OF WALES

AND THE

ARCHBISHOPS AND BISHOPS.



Bankers:

Messrs. BARCLAY & Co.,
1 Pall Mall East, S.W.

Office:

11 BUCKINGHAM STREET,
STRAND,
LONDON, W.C.

'The main agency by which the Church of the English nation tries to do its duty to the sailors of all nations.'—BISHOP OF STEPNEY.

The Lambeth Conference of Bishops, 1897, resolved—

'That it is the duty of the Church to aid in providing for the Moral and Spiritual needs of our Seamen of the Mercantile Service . . . by the ministrations of Clergy specially set apart for this work.'

This Church Society provides 270 Seamen's Chaplains, Lay Readers, Institute Keepers, Boatmen, &c., with Seamen's Churches and Institutes in 93 Ports situated in nearly every seaboard diocese in the world.

During recent years the Missions to Seamen has largely extended its work for Sailors in Colonial and Foreign Ports; **Church Offertories, Meetings, Subscriptions, &c., are urgently needed** to maintain and strengthen these extensions, and to open New Stations at Bombay, Alexandria, Brisbane and the great and growing Ports of South America.

Sailors are the representatives of our National Christianity in every part of the world, and by the lives they live in Ports abroad must be either the greatest help or the greatest hindrance to Missionary work.

STUART C. KNOX, M.A., *Secretary.*

THE MISSIONS TO SEAMEN, 11 BUCKINGHAM STREET, STRAND, LONDON, W.C.

150th YEAR.

The Orphan Working School and Alexandra Orphanage.

(FOUNDED 1758). UNDER THE PATRONAGE OF

HIS MAJESTY THE KING; HER MAJESTY QUEEN ALEXANDRA.
HAVERSTOCK HILL, LONDON, N.W.; CONVALESCENT HOME, MARGATE.

President—H.R.H. THE PRINCE OF WALES, K.G.

Treasurer—SIR HORACE BROOKS MARSHALL, M.A., LL.D., J.P.

Bankers—LONDON JOINT STOCK BANK, PRINCES STREET, E.C.

DEPENDENT UPON VOLUNTARY CONTRIBUTIONS. 500 Children are maintained and educated at the present time.

CONTRIBUTIONS WILL BE THANKFULLY RECEIVED.

Annual Subscription for One Vote at each Election, 10s. 6d.; for Two Votes, £1 1s.

Life Donation for One Vote at each Election, £5 5s.; for Two Votes, £10 10s.

The Votes increasing in proportion to the Contribution.

Life Presentation, £262 10s. Presentation of a child without Election, amounts vary according to age.

Children from all parts of the Empire are admitted from Infancy up to 11 Years of Age, and kept till 14, or (in special cases) 15.

ONE THOUSAND NEW ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTIONS ARE URGENTLY NEEDED.

Subscriptions, Donations, and all communications should be forwarded to the Secretary.

ALEXANDER GRANT, 73 Cheapside, London, E.C.

PREFACE

THE work of this Section was preceded last year by the publication of a set of Preliminary Papers, and later by the publication of a further series of Pan-Anglican Papers, arranged in four groups: (1) Marriage, (2) Morality in Commercial and Social Life, (3) Capital and Labour, and (4) Christianity and Socialism. It is right to say that every effort was made, in selecting writers of papers no less than in selecting speakers at the meetings, to secure the expression of diverse views on salient points. So far as this can be supposed to have failed, it is due to three causes: (1) the apparent unwillingness of many who were asked to put their views on paper or advocate them in person; (2) the difficulty of learning the individual opinions of representative speakers, particularly delegates from abroad; and (3) the extent to which modern economic science has influenced public opinion.

This is not the place to enter on any analysis of the various speeches and discussions; but it may be allowed to emphasize a few of the main points to which they draw the Church's careful consideration:---

- (1) That the Sanctity of Marriage is the basis of Human Society.
- (2) That Gambling, Drunkenness, Luxury, Sweating, and Bad Housing, are great social sins urgently needing remedy.
- (3) That Limited Liability Companies have widely extended the responsibilities of Capital; and, therefore, that warnings against the misuse of wealth or any indifference to ethical claims apply to most of us.

- (4) That the demand for the control of economic evils by public law is at least as important as the assertion of individual liberty.
- (5) That the problem of unemployment urgently requires the immediate attention of the community as a whole.
- (6) That Religion and Ethics can never be rightly severed from the motives of economic life.
- (7) That, whether or no we are Socialists in the narrower and more technical sense, it is not to be denied that "the socialistic movement is based upon a great demand for justice in human life", and that, speaking generally, the moral ideas of the movement are akin to Christianity.
- (8) That a first charge upon industry is the proper payment of the workman—using that term in its widest and most comprehensive meaning—with a view to securing his economic independence and efficiency.
- (9) That fearlessly to assist in the evolution of a just and efficient organization of society, by the exercise of her prophetic office, without committing herself to any partisan politics, is a paramount duty of the Church of God.

The crowded audiences—their remarkable tolerance, their obvious interest, their sympathetic applause—all served to emphasize the fact that the Church has a distinct and solemn responsibility for the practical solution of all the problems of Human Society; and that, for Christian people, the Christian Law, as revealed in the Person of our Lord Jesus Christ, supplies the indispensable moral motives for the right guidance and control of each and every department of social life.

The arrangement of this volume is as follows. Part I contains the speeches at the Mass Meetings in the Albert Hall and at the Church House, and the addresses at the

special service in St. Paul's Cathedral, on Tuesday evening, June 16; and also the speeches and discussions at the morning and afternoon sessions in the Albert Hall throughout the Congress week. Part II contains the several groups of Pan-Anglican Papers for Section A, published before the Congress met.

A general list of contents will be found at the beginning of the volume, and a more detailed index of authors at the end.

The Church is greatly indebted to all those who in any capacity helped to promote the success of Section A, and we should, above all, give thanks to Almighty God for all He has enabled us to do by the inspiration and guidance of His Holy Spirit.

T. C. FRY.

J. CARTER.

Hon. Secretaries.

July 23, 1908.

Handbooks of English Church Expansion.

Edited by the **Rev. Canon DODSON, M.A.**, Principal of St. Paul's Missionary College, Burgh,

and the **Rev. Canon BULLOCK-WEBSTER, M.A.**, Hon. Canon of Ely Cathedral.

With a General Preface by the **BISHOP OF ST. ALBANS.**

*Each book contains about 200 pages with Map and Illustrations.
Cloth, 2s. net each.*

JAPAN. By Mrs. EDWARD BICKERSTETH.

WESTERN CANADA. By the Rev. CANON NORMAN TUCKER, M.A., D.C.L., Toronto, General Secretary of the Missionary Society of the Church of England in Canada.

CHINA. By the Rev. F. L. NORRIS, M.A., of the Church of England Mission, Peking.

AUSTRALIA. By the Rev. A. E. DAVID, M.A., sometime Archdeacon of Brisbane.

SOUTH AFRICA. By the Right Rev. BISHOP HAMILTON BAYNES, D.D., sometime Bishop of Natal.

NORTH INDIA. By the Rev. C. F. ANDREWS, M.A., Fellow of Pembroke College, Cambridge, and Member of the Cambridge Mission to Delhi. *[In Preparation.]*

'The *format* of the series is excellent, neat, artistic, and convenient to handle. . . . The contents deserve equally high praise; they present the work of experts, they are also marvels of lucid condensation. . . . If the remainder of the series can be maintained at this high level of efficiency and interest the success of the series, which fills a serious gap in the literature of the Church, is assured.'—*The Guardian*.

'We welcome and wish every success to this series.'—*Church Times*.

A. R. MOWBRAY & CO., Ltd., 34 Great Castle Street,
Oxford Circus, London, W.; and at Oxford.

LONDON COLLEGE OF DIVINITY,

St. John's Hall, Highbury, London, N.

FOUNDED FOR THE TRAINING OF CANDIDATES FOR
HOLY ORDERS.

Visitor: THE LORD BISHOP OF LONDON.

President: THE VERY REV. THE DEAN OF CANTERBURY.

Principal and Professor of Biblical Exegesis . . . REV. A. W. GREENUP, D.D.

Professor of Homiletics and Pastoral Theology . . . REV. E. G. HODGE, M.A.

Resident Tutors { REV. C. S. WALLIS, B.A.
REV. C. H. GILL, M.A.

Lecturer in Ecclesiastical History REV. H. F. GASTER, M.A.

Lecturer in Philosophy REV. H. SMITH, M.A.

Lecturer in Comparative Religions REV. ST. C. TISDALL, D.D.

Lecturer in Semitic Languages REV. H. G. HARDING.

The Hall is one of the Schools of Theology in the University of London, and is affiliated to the University of Durham.

For particulars of Fees, Exhibitions, &c., apply to the Principal.

CONTENTS

PART I

SPEECHES AND DISCUSSIONS

	PAGE
MASS MEETING IN THE ALBERT HALL	2
MASS MEETING IN THE CHURCH HOUSE	15
SPECIAL SERVICE IN ST. PAUL'S CATHEDRAL.	20
MARRIAGE IN CHRISTENDOM	30
MARRIAGE IN HEATHENDOM	37
SWEATED INDUSTRIES.	46
HOUSING AND FAMILY LIFE	57
THE DRINK TRAFFIC.	63
GAMBLING AND SPECULATION	71
CAPITAL	78
LABOUR	85
MONOPOLIES	91
CHRISTIANITY AND SOCIALISM	98
WHAT IS NOW PRACTICABLE IN SOCIALISM	106

PART II

PAN-ANGLICAN PAPERS

GROUPS I AND II

MARRIAGE

	NO.
THE SANCTITY OF MARRIAGE AS THE BASIS OF HUMAN SOCIETY. By the Rev. J. H. F. Peile, M.A.	1 ^a
THE SANCTITY OF MARRIAGE. By the Rt. Rev. W. C. Doane, D.D., LL.D., Bishop of Albany	1 ^b
LAWS AND CUSTOMS OF MARRIAGE IN NON-CHRISTIAN LANDS AS BEARING ON MISSION DIFFICULTIES. By the Rt. Rev. J. W. Williams, D.D., Bishop of St. John's, Kaffraria	1 ^c
CHRISTIANITY AND MARRIAGE QUESTIONS IN JAPAN. By the Rt. Rev. W. A. Awdry, D.D., Bishop of South Tokyo	1 ^d
RECENT DEVELOPMENTS OF LICENCE AS TO MARRIAGE IN ENGLAND. By the Rev. E. Davis, M.A.	1 ^e

GROUP III

MORALITY IN COMMERCIAL AND SOCIAL LIFE

GAMBLING AMONGST MEN. By the Rev. Paul B. Bull, M.A.	3 ^a
BETTING AND GAMBLING AMONG WORKING WOMEN AND GIRLS. By Miss Augusta Deane	3 ^b

	NO.
SOME PRESENT ASPECTS OF THE TEMPERANCE PROBLEM IN ENGLAND. By H. J. Torr, J.P.	3 ^e
LUXURY. By the Rev. P. Dearmer, M.A.	3 ^d
SWEATING. By Miss Gertrude M. Tuckwell	3 ^e
THE FAMILY. By R. A. Bray, L.C.C.	3 ^f
THE STOCK EXCHANGE AND GAMBLING. Anon.	3 ^h
THE HOUSING PROBLEM. By Alderman W. Thompson	3 ⁱ
RURAL HOUSING. By Miss Cochrane	3 ^k

GROUPS IV AND V

CAPITAL AND LABOUR

COMPANIES AND CONSCIENCE: JUSTICE AND DIVIDENDS. By Charles Roden Buxton	4 ^a
THE MORALITY OF CONTROL OF CAPITAL BY LEGISLATIVE ACTION. By the Rev. Canon H. S. Holland, M.A., Hon. D.Litt.	4 ^b
TRADE ORGANIZATION. By H. B. Lees-Smith, M.A.	4 ^c
THE UNEMPLOYED. By the Rev. F. Lewis Donaldson, M.A.	4 ^d
CHARITABLE RELIEF. By the Rev. W. W. Hough, M.A.	4 ^e
RELIGION AND WAGES. By the Rev. A. J. Carlyle, M.A.	4 ^f
THE FUNCTION OF THE CLERGY IN REGARD TO ECONOMIC LIFE. By the Rev. W. Cunningham, D.D., Archdeacon of Ely	4 ^g
THE PRINCIPLES OF STATE INTERFERENCE. By W. H. Draper, M.A.	5 ^a
MUNICIPAL TRADING. By the Rev. A. J. Carlyle, M.A.	5 ^b
ENGLAND AND INDIA. By the Rev. C. F. Andrews, M.A.	5 ^c

GROUP VI

CHRISTIANITY AND SOCIALISM

	NO.
CHRISTIANITY AND SOCIALISM. By the Rt. Rev. Charles Gore, D.D., Bishop of Birmingham	6 ^a
CHRISTIANITY AND SOCIALISM. By the Rev. H. Erskine Hill, M.A.	6 ^b
SOCIALISM, ABSTRACT AND ACTUAL. By the Rev. Clement F. Rogers, M.A.	6 ^c
CHRISTIANITY AND SOCIALISM: WHAT IS NOW PRACTICABLE? By Douglas Eyre, B.A.	6 ^d
THE DUTY OF THE CLERGY TOWARDS SOCIAL REFORM. By the Rev. J. G. Simpson, M.A.	6 ^e
WHAT IS CHRISTIAN IN SOCIALISM? By the Rev. Arnold Pinchard	6 ^f
CHRISTIANITY AND SOCIALISM. By the Rev. C. B. Wilmer, D.D.	6 ^g

THE
CHURCH AND HUMAN SOCIETY

MASS MEETINGS IN THE ALBERT HALL
AND AT THE CHURCH HOUSE
AND SPECIAL SERVICE IN
ST. PAUL'S CATHEDRAL
TUESDAY EVENING, JUNE 16

THE CHURCH AND HUMAN SOCIETY

ALBERT HALL. TUESDAY EVENING, JUNE 16

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY presided at this meeting. Prayers were said by BISHOP MONTGOMERY. The Archbishop, who was warmly received on rising to deliver his Inaugural Address, said: Brothers and sisters in the Lord Jesus Christ, fellow churchmen and churchwomen, it is my high privilege to-night, in this first of our great mass meetings, to offer to the Congress, in all its parts, a few words of welcome and God-speed. Those responsible for our plan have arranged its details with the courage of genius, in the spirit of buoyant hopefulness appropriate to our Faith, and with the quiet persistence of practical business men. It is a gathering, be it remembered, which in its conception and character is absolutely without precedent in the history of Christendom. For many months it has been in the forefront of our thoughts and prayers. If I can claim no great share in the troubles and anxieties of these vast arrangements it is because my friends and colleagues have generously recognized that, with the immense responsibilities of the approaching Lambeth Conference of bishops upon my shoulders, I might fairly leave this task to others. I am all the more free to express my admiration for what they have—shall I say accomplished?—at all events bravely striven to accomplish. It is a thing, as I have said, to which Church history offers no precedent and no parallel. When our 250 bishops meet next month for their fifth decennial Conference, the task assigned to them at so great a juncture in the life of the world and the Church will be rendered at once more grave, more clear, and more possible by reason of the great Congress which has gone before.

Most of the great Church gatherings in European history have had it for their object to assert—rightly and worthily to assert—doctrinal truth, or to denounce credal error, or to rally men, as Peter the Hermit rallied men, to a physical onslaught upon human foes. Then, too, there were high enthusiasms. Princes, nobles, peasants, women, soldiers, clergy, even little children, caught the grand contagion. The crusader sleeps now upon his marble tomb. We are banded to-day simply and straightforwardly, in the strength of the Lord Jesus Christ, for another and a nobler crusade. It is to make His living message tell more fruitfully, by our earnest and instructed thought, by our eager and disciplined effort, upon the daily life of the people of the world, for whose redemption He died upon the Cross. We

come to this mustering-hour as men and women who believe in the grandeur of their heritage of blessing, of work, of responsibility. We come together, not incidentally or lightly, but with set purpose, and with soul as well as mind prepared.

In the providence of our Lord God the epoch of our Church's expansion over the round world is also the epoch when, for the first time—by modern facilities of travel and post and printing-press—such a gathering as this has become possible. He Who gave us the opportunity is teaching us how to use it. It is His direct gift. We must surely have felt it yesterday when we knelt down in the time-hallowed Abbey, and in a service which none who took part in it will ever forget, began our doings with self-dedication and prayer. "Take off thy shoes from off thy feet, for the place whereon thou standest," to speak and hear, to think and plan, "is holy ground."

Our whole Congress effort corresponds I think not unfairly to the position which our Church holds in Christendom—strong and large in its definite organization, but marked by the peculiar faculty of including and developing differences of gifts, and of even welcoming varieties of opinion without breach of the bond which makes us one. Distinctions, racial and national, can with us find full and independent expression and expansion while yet the oneness is unimpaired. As has been well said in one of the papers in your hands: "Secure in its constitution and its message, our Church enjoys the fullest freedom of adaptation to fresh circumstances. Because it has been purged of mistaken accretions and traditions, it possesses an unrivalled faculty of applying the original deposit of the Faith, not only to the restless activity of modern thought, but also to the widely divergent needs of different types of mankind." All that, to one who will read our storied life aright, ought to be self-evident, and the Congress is the mere expression of it. Ours is, in the words of Bishop Creighton, "a system instinct with life, full of mighty possibilities, with a world-wide mission peculiarly its own."

One practical note, however, I should like, in fewest possible words, to strike to-night as to the actual use and fruit of what we are doing. The sheer bigness of our gatherings—look round you at this moment and remember that this is only one of many—the range and variety of our subjects, the diversity of home conditions represented here by those who have and who have not crossed the sea, and, above all, the flood of new literature which has been engulfing us—all this may easily either excite or bewilder us. Perhaps both. Be on your guard. There is of course a splendid exhilaration in the mere presence of such a multitude swayed by one emotion, inspired by one ideal, and we have abundant place for it in days like these. But our clear specific purpose in planning this congress has been the diffusion of a sounder knowledge as well as the stirring of a keen resolve. If the quickening of our pulses in the enthusiastic sense of a wider brotherhood

were to be its only outcome, it would almost certainly be evanescent for most of us, and a few years hence we might almost as well have never held the congress at all. We have meant something greater even than that deepened sense of brotherhood and of bigness, and, speaking with all reverence, we mean, please God, to have it.

Our purpose is illimitably great. He who runs may read it in the very titles and subjects of our debates. For each in succession we have to think out deliberately and prayerfully what it is we aim at doing; what it is that we expect to do. Take for example to-night's vast subject—"The Church and Human Society"—with its special application to social and industrial problems. The Church as such is not called upon, we are often told, to solve those problems. No; but it is called upon, as has been well said, to provide the men, the principles, and the public which will solve them. Quite deliberately we intend to put our brains into this endeavour. We intend to think and know more than we have thought and known before about the facts of to-day and the possibilities of to-morrow in the kingdom upon earth of our living Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

We are trusted as Christ's soldiers and servants to set forward His cause against whatsoever is cowardly or selfish or impure. In the deliberate girding ourselves here and now to that inspiring enterprise we want to be at our best. To come to the task unequipped would be both unworthy and ineffective. It is like throwing a little water upon a great fire. For once at least in our lives—witness the three millions and a half of booklets now in active circulation—we have tried to prepare ourselves to do our work adequately and aright.

For once at least in our lives—am I wrong in saying that a vast number of those who will attend the Congress have been in the habit of giving much less brain-work to the things which concern our Faith than they give to any other serious concern in their daily life? I am far from saying that they care less about it, or that they are not genuine and earnest in that caring. But have most of us given to the things which belong to our religious life, or to the life of our Church at home and abroad, the same real study and application as we should all feel bound to give to a scientific or literary subject which we wanted, as grown-up people, to understand? Perhaps I am wrong, but I think that a great many of us almost take for granted that we know about our Bibles and our Creeds—"We learned that," we say, "when we were children, or when we were confirmed"—and now by some strange eccentricity we suppose that that will do, and so put no real backbone into the study, as grown-up people, of the very things which, after all, if they are true, matter more than any others. Now this Congress, whatever else it does, is going to show us that that easy-going way of looking at the matter will not do, that claiming to be Christians, claiming to be English Churchmen and Churchwomen, we have no sort of

right to rest content with our ignorance ; nay, to many of us it is discreditable in the highest and deepest degree. Hence the rightness of the pains we are taking in this Congress that its keynote shall be "Think out your Faith and its application". We want everybody who attends this Congress, if he or she will be at the pains to do so, to be abreast of the subjects we are considering, or at the least to be set upon the lines of right thinking and right learning about past history, present facts, and dawning opportunities. Let no one think he or she is going to use this Congress rightly by going round from meeting to meeting and listening to weighty words, now here, now there, upon a whole string of subjects in succession. Make of it a serious endeavour to know with reasonable thoroughness about some one branch at least of the work of the Church of Christ among present-day strivings and difficulties, and then with bowed head thank God that you are allowed, if you will, to be, however humbly, in some little bit of his vineyard a fellow-worker with the Lord Himself for the bettering and brightening of the dusty lives of men and women, and the making some tiny bit of earth a little more like what His kingdom ought to be. Be such our Congress enterprise as a whole and in its every part. If we enter upon it in the fullness of loyal devotion to Him whose Name we bear, if we enter upon it in the simple confidence that our prayers are heard and answered, if we enter upon it with the thought of what is meant by our brotherhood in Him, it will do its work. It will reveal to us or it will remind us of the greatness of our heritage, and then it will inspire us to be up and doing in the Master's service and to give Him of our very best. "It is not a vain thing for us ; it is our life."

The BISHOP OF MASSACHUSETTS said his first word would be to voice the regret of the meeting in the absence, through serious illness, of the Chairman of Section A, the Bishop of Birmingham, who, as President of the C.S.U. for a number of years, had shown and expressed, not only by word but by deed, his interest in the deep problems of the Church and human society. The Bishop then proceeded with his address. What relations, he asked, did the Church bear to Society? Catch for a moment a glimpse of three cities.

First, Jerusalem, immediately after the descent of the Holy Spirit ; the same city that crucified our Lord, with Herod, Pilate, and the Pharisees still there ; hypocrisy, injustice, the devouring of widows' houses still going on ; but 3,000 men and women pledged to Christ. Two of these went at the ninth hour to the beautiful gate of the temple, and there finding one who asked for alms, they gave to him, not what he asked, silver and gold, but health, physical and spiritual, and he leapt up and praised God. The type of the Church as she was, and is to be, in human society.

The second city was the Apocalypse, the heavenly Jerusalem, new Jerusalem transfigured by the light and the power of Christ through the work of the Church—the Church is the city, the city is the Church. There was no temple there, for the Lord God was the temple, and there was nothing that defiled. The whole city was purified, transfigured, and transformed, for the work of those 3,000 men and women had been carried through to the finish.

The bishop then referred to the modern city—London, New York, Peking, Calcutta, Rome—still sin, injustice, sorrow, physical ill, but in the midst of the city is the Church of Christ, and the work of the Church of Christ was not first a depository of the faith, not as a fortress to stand outside, but as a living, spiritual power, a dynamic force, a power-house, that through the members of the Church and the body of the Church was to send light and spiritual force into every home. Those 3,000 men and women were not a horde of disintegrated people. They were first, each one of them, bound together by the spirit of Christ. There were, the bishop continued, people who were so overwhelmed with what was called social consciousness that they sometimes forgot that behind social consciousness there must be, if it was to be effective, the consciousness of Christ within the life of him who was to reform the city.

The relationship between the Church and human society was this: a spiritual power which, with enthusiasm and devotion to the Master, and love of man, intelligently and earnestly throws itself into the centre of human society to transfuse and transform it by the power of Christ into something like the heavenly Jerusalem. He suggested a few simple principles running out from that. First, the Church was not the clergy—the Church was the Church and the whole Church. There were times when there seemed to be call for a reform, or a voice of protest against some sin or against some evil arising in society, and a voice comes up from the laity, "Why do not the clergy do something?" And the voice went back from the clergy, and he believed from Christ Himself, that as the laity lived in the world it was they, as Christ's servants, to do something themselves. It was well, he continued, for a man to give £50 to the Hospital Sunday Fund, but it would be still better if he looked into his methods of business to discover how the £50 was made. (Hear, hear.) Might it also not be more important that he should see that the cottages which he owned, the railroad which he partially controlled, the mines in which he had an interest, were conducted on good lines, and that the sanitary arrangements of his property were as they should be, so that he should not be filling the hospital which he aspired to help. He might also throw his efforts into legislation which would help to decrease the number of besotted women rather than helping the child of a drunkard and getting it into a children's home. It was in these things that the laity had their place as well as the clergy in the development of the work of the Church.

Again, social life was intricate in these days. When a man had his estate of five cottages he knew exactly his relations to his people ; but when he sold his estate and invested the money in the shares of a mine or railway or trust, he knew not how he stood (hear, hear), and he could not help it for the present. It was one of the conditions of society, and the difficulty was that they had often to shoot at long range at sin, and it took a skilful marksman to hit at that range. Finally, this generation was being built up in the midst of an enormous increase of wealth and of material power, through the adjustment of brains in the development of material resources. They all wanted brains, and most of them wanted more of the material. The great development of the material power of the age—gigantic, awful, but splendid—was the challenge for the Church to come and pour into that material power through the lives of those who controlled the material resources—the great body of the working people, the middle class people, the capitalists and all—to pour into their hearts and lives such moral enthusiasm as would bring the power of Christ to bear, and would make the giant of to-day a giant great, not only in power of body, but in power of spirit, through faith in Christ.

MISS GERTRUDE TUCKWELL said : They knew how often in our Lord's teaching He drew His lessons from a little child. You remember, she continued, how often he used the purity of a child for a rebuke. How He told those who would enter the Kingdom of God that they should become as little children. You know how, once a year, we kneel in adoration before the cradle of a child. Working for six years among the children of the poorest quarters of two of our great cities, I felt how true our Lord's similes were. They passed through my hands and under my eyes each day, instinct with every power for good, waiting only for noble impulses to make them our salvation as the future citizens of this land. But they were delicate material, and those who are educationists will tell you that they should be trained only by the play which is teaching and the teaching which is play. Think of that material, and think a little of what is happening to it to-day. Here, and in the United States, as our American friends will bear me out, hundreds of thousands of children are wage-earners. They are toiling in our factories, amid the clang of machinery, falling exhausted at night to sleep. They are selling match-boxes and newspapers, exposed—wizened, precocious, old before their time—to all the evil of the streets. Worse, they are working in the place they call home, that place in which often one room is work-place, living-room, sleeping-room, laundry, kitchen, hospital, and mortuary as well. They are there at all ages. Baby fingers card the hooks and eyes and paste the matchboxes. The decrepit and the deformed are pressed into the service, and there the aged work till the work falls only from fingers which are dead. You know how they start for life ; to fight where nothing but efficiency

gives power to wrestle, handicapped, possessing perhaps some small manual dexterity, and that alone. These, Christ's little ones, are forming, in this generation and the next, the criminal, the unemployable, and the unemployed. This is what we are doing with our children. And, on the other side, what is there? Wealth piled up in a few hands, spent often fantastically. Factories and work places paying 100 per cent. dividend, where work-girls struggle on 10s. a week. You know of the gambling on the stock exchange, of the false side of great part of our commercial system.

This is the reverse of the medal. On one side monopoly, and on the other starvation. In the past—only in the past, for economists now have recognized the truth—such a system as this has been bolstered up by a false political economy; false because it has taken no notice of other social laws, and so, as a great political economist has said, "It becomes a tissue of pretended laws of industry by which selfishness glosses over to itself the frightful consequences of its own passion." So we have defrauded the labourer of his hire, the children of their youth, and the old of their rest. You and I agree, or we should not be here. Have you never heard, as I have, a voice saying, "My house shall be called a house of prayer, and ye have made it a den of thieves?" Where shall we turn? Will you try the governments? The governments are what you make them. (Hear, hear.) My friends from Australia and New Zealand have made them brave in experiment, courageous in their labour laws. Here we are terrified to touch old and brittle institutions. Our governments, be they Tory or Liberal, are alike in one thing: they are like that man who, having a talent given to him, wrapped it in a cloth and laid it in the ground and gave it back to the Master when the year had passed, with no increase. It is our fault that they are afraid to sacrifice the monopolies which have largely created this wrong without intolerable compensation.

We are the arbitrators, and it is the hope of our future that in every English-speaking country there is to-day society after society, bodies of people in all the Churches, not alone our own, who have strung themselves together to watch and interpret the labour movement, to understand what it is that the people want. You know in the States, as here, that there is a deep unrest among the people. Generation after generation has helped that unrest, as Ruskin told us, by almsgiving and preaching patience, and by every other means emollient and consolatory, everything except the one thing God orders for them—justice. I have said that my hope is in ourselves. It is we who make public opinion, we who are every year more and more trying to interpret the people's wishes, to help them in struggles, often blind. It is we who are trying to be their spokesmen, to guide them and to save the children from the conditions which I have described. We are going to try to administer those industrial laws which every country has, but often disregards while the workers suffer from

fines and deductions, from long hours, from overtime, from many a misery which the law would sweep away. We have to develop new laws, to raise the age of the children, and give them back to school and play. (Hear, hear.) We have to restore the married women to their homes (applause); to stop this awful mass of infantile mortality, by which, in some of our great northern towns, 200 in every 1,000 die before they are twelve months old. We have to help the workers to secure for themselves a minimum wage. These women I have spoken of are working for 1*d.* and 2*d.* an hour. All the labour of a family may perhaps make 6*s.* or 7*s.* a week, and the women say to you when you urge them not to allow their children to struggle thus: "If they do not work they will starve." So by wise labour laws, by regulating the wage, by stopping its falling below a point at which subsistence is possible, as it falls now in thousands of cases, we shall have done much.

But there is more. "The old order changeth, giving place to new." Let us listen to those who speak of a different and better distribution of wealth. Let us listen to those who are bringing forward, not new, but very old dreams of a world in which there shall be a possibility of happy life and equal prospects for all. Those who speak of Socialism speak wisely. Learn what it really means. Divest it of all that is crude and much that misrepresents it. See if it is not really an attempt to bring back the Kingdom of God to earth. Above all, watch and think for yourself about these things. Learn, read, discuss—everything. It was once a worse disgrace to be called a Christian than to be called a Socialist now. It may be that the time will come when you will find that in this doctrine, wisely interpreted, there lies what Christ would have us hear. It will not be in this generation that we shall see the desire of our hearts, but the supreme justification of our lives will surely have been to have worked for it, to have helped to cleanse His temple, that through our agency the curse which rests on those who have offended His little ones shall pass away.

The hymn "The Church's one Foundation" having been sung, BISHOP MONTGOMERY read a telegram from the Primate of New Zealand, in which he said: "Heartiest congratulations from the Church in New Zealand to the Congress on its first opening. New Zealand churchmen pray for a blessing upon your labours." A message had also been received from the Baptist Union, which read: "The Council of the Baptist Union of Great Britain and Ireland, now in session, sends affectionate greetings to His Grace the President, and to the members of the Pan-Anglican Congress, very cordially recognizing the blessing attending their work for the Saviour in all parts of the world; and they pray that their deliberations may promote His glory and further the extension of His Kingdom. May grace, mercy, and peace from God our Father, and Jesus Christ our Lord, rest upon all their

assemblies. Charles Brown, President of the Baptist Union of Great Britain and Ireland."

The BISHOP OF MONTREAL said that it seemed hard, if not impossible, to attempt to follow the exquisitely beautiful address, so full of sorrowful pleading and so full of truth, of Miss Tuckwell. In some way, however, it fitted in wondrously with the single thought that he was anxious to bring before that vast audience: if the Church of God, not the clergy, but the whole united Church of God, did its duty in the spirit of its Master, the previous speaker (Miss Tuckwell) could have had no such tale to tell. (Hear, hear.) It stood to reason that what she had pictured could never stand side by side with the perfect fulfilment of the law of Christ, and the lesson that came home to them all as Christian people, having heard those facts, was to pray to God that not only their whole hearts, but the great beating, throbbing heart of the whole Anglican Communion, might be aroused to the sense that there was in its very midst, in all crowded centres, a cry that pleaded for Christ; a cry that prayed that Christ's teaching might be more definitely and distinctly carried out; a cry that if only each one of them heard it, would send out a power into the great world beyond, East, West, North, and South, to tell the peoples those things must no longer be. It was his blessing to come from a land where even in large centres it might be said that poverty was almost unknown; and even where there was want that want arose, not so much from the conditions of the country or the conditions of the Church, as from that reckless haste after evil which characterized all men everywhere. Hence they could easily understand how Miss Tuckwell's words had touched the heart of one who knew nothing of such conditions; but he could fancy the Lord Jesus Christ Himself, who saw all and heard all, listening to that tale of pity, and calling on this great nation to rise and give an answer to it worthy of His name.

They should lay hold of one thing, and cling to it with a grasp that could not be broken, and that was the mission that Christ had given to His Church in this world. How often did they take for granted, as some speaker had said, the great facts connected with our common Christianity, and the great duties those facts should spur them on to; and yet all the time lifted no hand, raised no voice, because their own barque moved on limpid waters that passed on quietly to the haven that they themselves would have them pass to. The Church of God was not meant for that. When our Lord gave the great command, "Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature," He meant not that. He meant that there should live and burn within the heart of every Christian clergyman the great determination that whatever life might enable him to do that life would put in its forefront the honour and glory of Christ through the success and sweeping onward of His Church.

As I sat here to-night, he continued, it flashed across my mind as I looked at this great building filled with human beings, that somewhere I had seen this picture before. Do you know what I thought of? I thought of the great walls of the Coliseum in Rome, tier upon tier, gallery upon gallery, filled with human beings as this great hall is filled to-night, but not one of them Christian save those that were contending with the lions in the arena. Look around and you see your Coliseum, but in such vastly different circumstances. What brings you here? What led you here to-night? What spirit entered into your mind at all that you should cast in your lot with this great meeting? The honour and glory of that Christ, of whom the old heathen knew not but whose name to-day is world-wide. Bring that Christ into your social questions. Bring the spirit of that Christ into the poverty of the poor. Bring that spirit of Christ into the sickness of the weak. Bring that loving tenderness of Christ into the child life of the world, and your hand touches the lever that no great king on earth could ever lead you to touch, for it is the spirit of the living God that tells you that where there is Christ there is liberty.

CANON SCOTT HOLLAND, who was received with prolonged applause, said that they desired that that vast meeting should have action as its one purpose; and therefore he supposed that he had been asked to speak on an unfortunate phrase which, just at the moment when they were ready for action, just at the moment when a cause was fired to the right point, fell on them always from lips that seemed to be creditable and honest, with a damping dismay, saying, "You cannot make people good by Act of Parliament." He knew of no phrase so disastrous, more especially with Church people, because they were so well aware of its truth that they were unable to see how wholly false it was in its application. "You cannot make people good by Act of Parliament." Indeed they could not; everybody knew that. That was the heart of the moral problem; man could not be made good. That was what they meant by believing in the moral will. No power on earth could make a man good; much less an Act of Parliament.

There was only one power on earth that could make a man good, and that was man himself. Man could make himself good; and they might just remind themselves that this was the very law of the Incarnation. So impossible was it to make man good by any outside force in the world that God Himself had to become man in order that man might be enabled to make himself good. Man could not be forced to be good; but he could, by exercising pressure on himself—by patience, perseverance, penitence, and effort of all kinds—force himself to be good; and his task here on earth was to compel himself to become good. One of the materials he could use, by which he could exercise the necessary material pressure on himself, was an Act of Parliament. People talked as

if an Act of Parliament dropped from the skies on a man, but it was really the act of a man's own will. Man endeavoured in it to lay hands upon himself. It proceeded entirely from within and not from without. It was man's own endeavour to realize his own moral energies so that he might create an environment in which he might have some chance of being good. An Act of Parliament is just a sign that he is becoming good. It was a signal thrown out that man had really got a good intention, that he had arrived at a right resolution, and that he was going to compel circumstances to minister to that resolution, and that he had really got a hope that he could better himself.

Man, by Act of Parliament, was setting to work to create his own destiny. An Act of Parliament was man's pressure laid on his environment. Was anybody going to assert that environment was not significant of a man's moral career, that it played no part in determining how far a man should be good? At this day they learned that all their old terrors connected with heredity had practically vanished, because they had discovered, and Father Waggett was always telling them so, that they had so many grandfathers inside them all swarming to get out that they were a sort of Rugby scrum (laughter), and there was only a chance, in our brief career on earth, for about one or two grandfathers to emerge. The swarming mass of grandfathers were pressing to get out, and only one or two were going to have that opportunity. That was heredity, and environment gave them the opportunity and determined which grandfather should emerge.

Environment was vital. Everybody who had to do with infantile mortality was speaking of the power of environment. Anything could be done with children as they were born if they left all questions of heredity behind and gave them a chance of a decent environment. It was the most vital, the most urgent question before them. Environment being important, Acts of Parliament were also important. Environment was a vast and complicated thing; there was no limit to it; and therefore also there was no limit to the Acts of Parliament required. Environment was made by Acts of Parliament. What was determined by environment? The average level at which every individual should start. People spoke of legislation as if it damped individualism. On the contrary, it supplied that minimum of force which every individual required in order to begin. Environment represented the minimum level of solidarity without which individualism could not come into play. By environment and Acts of Parliament they determined where an individual should start; and the further on they gave him a start the further he would go.

The power of achievement of an individual depended upon the amount of start he was given through Acts of Parliament. That was the real law of life, and all civilization consisted in raising that minimum; in raising the foundation from which the individual began, and opening out to him a larger range of oppor-

tunities, freer opportunities, and a larger measure of resources. So a man became more and more free the more Acts of Parliament there were; since the more Acts of Parliament the better the environment, the fuller the resources, and the further a man could go. With these advantages a man would be kindled into finer energy, and would dare more for the community. There were three things which environment would secure for a man. First, equipment. It would secure a man a minimum equipment, which every man and woman must have in order to be on the level which life demands; and as the demands of life were raised year by year so the equipment must be raised. Secondly, Acts of Parliament would secure for a man some understructure. They would secure for him that there was a point below which he could not sink. They would accomplish that by securing a minimum wage. At present men and women were practically flung down into a morass; they might always be undercut, there might be always something that would drag them down. If this could be forbidden, then there would be a substructure laid down; a firm bottom to the morass. Man, woman, and child would be secured against the perils of getting down in the awful bog which at present swallowed them up. Then, thirdly, there would be consideration. All the great body of legislation would be saying to every man, woman, and child in England, "You are worth something, you count. Here the whole Parliament has taken the trouble to pass this law for you. There are people who really think of you. You poor girls crowded in those laundries, here is a whole world of Acts of Parliament giving you value."

Now, it was on that giving of value that all the moral growth depended. Think of the submerged world, as one walks down the Embankment and watches the crowds in the streets. Those broken outcast lives were simply the records of those unequal to bear the stress of modern conditions, because those lives had never been prepared by Acts of Parliament, by a decent environment, by all that could build up human life for the tasks that were set it to do. We could only reach that submerged world, and only lift it on to the level at which it could live, by Acts of Parliament. All that great world, whose faces we never saw, but through whom we obtained our food and on whom we lived, we could not touch; but the State could put out its great power of moral energy, which would cover the whole ground. Acts of Parliament were the only hope; the only hope by which they could save the submerged and realize their own responsibilities.

But Acts of Parliament were acts of moral will. They were only good when they were an expression of a nation's desire. It was of no use to pass Acts when there was no real desire behind them. Therefore they found themselves impatiently desiring thousands of Acts of Parliament that might create a good environment for every soul. But they could not pass them because the moral energy of the nation was too stagnant. Among Church people

there was no conscience alive that required those measures to be passed ; and it was necessary to build up the conscience from within. He called on all those who lived in the power of Christ's spirit to do their utmost to create this national conscience which would issue in Acts of Parliament. Without that conscience their task went to the wall ; and still God would look upon all that Miss Tuckwell had described that evening. They would pass them as the witnesses of their own strong and temperate desire that the vision that they had had of the city of God should try to make itself real. They would demand those Acts of Parliament as signs and signals of that conscience of the people which could not endure those intolerable things. They would demand those Acts with an instructed conscience ; and would continue demanding them on behalf of the weak, and on behalf of Christ's own honour. It was their desire that the burden should be lifted at last from loaded shoulders, and that the brazen doors should at last be open, and that power should go out through the nation expressing its own will to open out opportunity to all. The power would so go out to create such an environment around every soul that lived in England, that all would find freedom and gladness in fulfilling their vocation. If they could secure this by Act of Parliament, then it might be that they would not be wholly ashamed or afraid to answer at the judgement seat of God for what they had made of English life and English honour.

BISHOP MONTGOMERY announced that suitable replies would be dispatched to the messages received from the Baptist Union and from the Bishop of New Zealand. The BISHOP OF MASSACHUSETTS closed the proceedings with the Benediction,

THE CHURCH AND HUMAN SOCIETY

CHURCH HOUSE. TUESDAY EVENING, JUNE 16

The Chairman, the ARCHBISHOP OF MELBOURNE, having announced that the ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY would come on from the Albert Hall and give his Inaugural Address later, the BISHOP OF COLUMBIA was called upon to speak.

He represented, he said, the Church in part of the Dominion of Canada. Like all Gaul, in the opening sentences of the Commentaries of Julius Caesar, all Canada was "divided into three parts". Of the East he did not intend to speak, as he did not pretend to know the conditions; of the middle part, Rupert's Land, into which emigrants were pouring by tens of thousands, he knew a little more. In Saskatchewan Province, the great problem as to how these men were to have the ministrations of the Church had been grappled with by Archdeacon Lloyd, who brought back men with him from England, who were working in Saskatchewan under the most severe conditions. (Applause.)

To come to his own part of Canada, if they were only as good as their climate in Vancouver Island, they would be a model for the whole Anglican Communion; but the people of what was called the "Wild West" were really not very different from people at home or in Australia. They had some great advantages in his diocese of Vancouver Island. A man could earn a good day's wage (10s. a day) for a good day's work; and the expense of living was not so great as to swallow it all up, though this was sometimes said to him. They had problems in the Far West, but they did not see that crushing, galling, hideous poverty seen in the Old Country. The working man was able to save money to build his own house and have time for leisure, which in this country must be hard, if not impossible for him.

But the life had its dangers, for instance, the danger of selfishness among the labouring men. They were not anxious for new emigrants to British Columbia; there existed a feeling of great hostility against the Chinese, Japanese, and Hindus already there, who yet had done work which could not have been done otherwise. If the working man had in Vancouver that residuum of humanity which would come to any place if the doors were opened, he would find his wage soon pulled down. Was not that the difficulty at the root of all the troubles here—the absolutely undesirable people from the Continent? (Applause.) They caused the sweating-shops and the hideous competition.

Speaking of the drink question, he heard a member of Parliament recently state that he had crossed with Mr. John Burns from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and back again, and had only seen one drunken man. Exaggerated statements like that did harm. Until quite recently the saloons in Victoria, British Columbia, were open from one o'clock on Monday morning till twelve o'clock on Saturday night. There was a great deal of drinking among men on logging-camps. The drink problem faced them there, as here ; but on the whole continent of America determined efforts were being made to fight against it.

What was the meaning of having this section dealing with questions like that of drink but to set before people an ideal, not to fold our hands, and say these things had been and would be, but to come with a message from God Himself? With the secular education they had in British Columbia, which did not allow a single verse of the Bible to be read in schools, the people were in danger of drifting away from the faith. But he was thankful to say that the Church's foundations were well laid. In British Columbia, fifty years ago, there was only one bishop and five clergy ; to-day there were three bishops and a hundred clergy.

MR. DOUGLAS EYRE, vice-head of the Oxford House in Bethnal Green, spoke on the relation of the Church to Socialism—a matter of paramount importance in the Old Country and in the New ones. The Church was primarily concerned with the establishment of the Kingdom of Heaven upon earth ; it must realize that there was a movement towards the improvement of the social environment, and should sympathize with it, and seek to guide it aright. The Church will thus be led to look critically at the theory of Individualism ; and, after weighing it in the balances and finding it wanting, will turn to the rival theory of Socialism, and examine that also.

The speaker contended that it was the duty of the Church to insist on Socialism, not as a mere theory of economics, but as a theory of life, based on the fact that we were all members of one body, a society of co-operators, each bent on serving the community. In a State recognizing this principle, there would be paramount the legislative principle that the interests of the individual and of classes must give way to the welfare of the community. The message of the Church to the enfranchised democracies of the empire would be, he hoped—"God be with you. Test your principles and apply them by the light of God's revelation."

Progress, the speaker insisted, must be gradual ; not revolution, but evolution. In this country political enfranchisement had been by progressive, natural stages ; trade and commerce were now being emancipated from the control of privileged classes, but gradually. Trade-unionism, again, had been gradual in its growth.

Not only were we bound to believe in and work for progress, but also to believe in and work for comprehension. The principle of legislation for the twentieth century (the welfare of the whole community) was better than the principle of legislation in the nineteenth century (the greatest happiness of the greatest number), because it approached nearer the laws which God had laid down in connexion with the relation of His Kingdom to the development of human society. The law of comprehension was a law most absolutely necessary for us to observe if we wanted to solve properly the education question, for instance. Education must comprehend not only the material, but also the moral and spiritual education of the child. (Applause.) Another great law of God to insist upon was the law of the even balance, of equilibrium. Some socialists were unbalanced in their statements and political theories.

The speaker quoted, with approval, Benjamin Kidd's saying that "the most vigorous social systems are those in which are combined the most effective subordination of the individual to the social organism, with the highest development of his own personality". What we first needed was to develop equality of opportunity, to rescue, for instance, a large number of brilliant individual powers that they found many a boy or girl in East London endowed with. That these boys and girls had not equality of opportunity was a dead loss to the State itself. (Applause.) The Church must also speak out, and tell the people not to depend too much upon political action. There were influences other than political evils which enslaved the people, and the Church must insist that what they wanted greater material prosperity for was that they might mount upwards to a higher life. Whether they looked to the great principles on which social development depended, or to the methods by which the principles had to be carried into effect, what was practical, sound, and efficacious, depended entirely upon whether the principles and the machinery conformed to the law of God, or not.

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY having arrived, the CHAIRMAN introduced him, and his Grace read his Inaugural Address, identical with that just read at the Albert Hall meeting.

The BISHOP OF NORTH QUEENSLAND, who was next called upon, said he represented in some small degree the great Commonwealth of Australia, the workshop in which many of the social and political theories of the day were being tested and tried. Churchmen from Australia should bring whatever experience they might possess to lay at the disposal of churchmen and churchwomen at home, and although Australia was yet on a different plane in many respects from England, much might be learned from experience there.

He particularly desired to urge English Churchmen not to fall

into the mistake of confounding what were largely economic theories with Christianity (Hear, hear)—and, above all, not to use the power of the Church and of Christianity in overturning one economic theory for the purpose of setting up another. (Applause.) He could not quite support the previous speaker. Socialism and the labour movement had not been such an advance upon the state of affairs in England as he was inclined to believe. Socialism might shine with the reflected light of Christianity, but it was possible for an object to shine with the light of something else which it did not itself possess. (Laughter.) He thought Christian socialism could not exercise the influence upon the labour movement many thought would be the case. And in this connexion there was great need for people to remember that the various theories of socialism were giving place to a very practical outlook upon economic theories. In Australia this was certainly the case. Socialism there was largely identified with the labour movement. He was no foe to socialism, indeed, he considered himself a moderate socialist, as they most of them were in Australia; and on the whole he thought the condition of Australia much happier than that of more individualistic countries. Nor was he any foe to the labour party; he approved of much of the legislation to which they had given effect; but there were certain things connected with the movement which the Church should be free to attack, if occasion demanded it.

The speaker then alluded to the power of trade-unions and to their persecuting those who did not happen to agree with them. (Applause.) There need be none, yet there was a large connexion between Socialism (the Labour Party) and the anti-Christian element in the State. A certain very well-known labour paper in Queensland had a notice over the editor's door: "No dogs or gods admitted here." This blatant irreligion might submit to the right influence of Christianity, but such influence could not be exercised if Christianity identified itself with every part of the labour movement. (Applause.) The labour party was identifying itself in Australia with secular systems of education, such as they had in Queensland and Victoria. Individuals were not necessarily anti-Christian, but the system was largely running upon anti-Christian lines.

He urged caution in the matter of Christian socialism. It was very possible for a priest with inadequate knowledge to do a very great amount of harm by his advocacy of any particular method of economic thought. (Hear, hear.) He supposed there was much truth in Mr. Balfour's saying that bishops were not altogether the best judges about the Licensing question; and though they knew much about the evils of drink, they had not necessarily adequate knowledge for dealing with economic difficulties. He particularly cautioned the younger clergy to remember that all knowledge was not necessarily the possession of youth. (Laughter.) The fact is that clergy do not always realize that they have a power outside

themselves of which they are custodians, not the absolute possessors. And if they use that power unwisely, they may easily be guilty of great injustice, which will react upon religion, not directly upon themselves.

He had many friends who were socialists and members of the labour party in Australia ; and he was not prepared to forbid that men should speak in the name of progress because they did not speak in the name of Christ ; but neither did he expect that he must necessarily subordinate his religion to the economic theories of the labour party, even though these might also be regarded by some as a movement for bettering the conditions of life. (Applause.)

The CHAIRMAN, before closing the meeting, read a telegram addressed to the President of the Pan-Anglican Congress from the United Methodist Church :—"The Conference of the United Methodist Church assembled in Hanover Chapel, Sheffield, sends greeting, and prays that the great Head of the Church may guide the Pan-Anglican Congress in all its deliberations." (Great applause.) Any message of that kind, said the Chairman, was welcome to them, and would be duly dealt with in the name of the Congress.

THE CHURCH AND HUMAN SOCIETY AND CHRISTIAN TRUTH

ST. PAUL'S CATHEDRAL. TUESDAY EVENING, JUNE 16

The first of a series of gatherings in St. Paul's Cathedral was held on Tuesday evening, June 16, when the subject of the discourses was "The Church and Human Society and Christian Truth". The service was opened with the singing of the hymn commencing "When I survey the wondrous Cross".

The BISHOP OF IPSWICH, in an introductory address inviting to penitence, said: It is hard to put in a few words the real shame and sorrow that the Church may well feel as she thinks of those vast fields of human endeavour and achievement and toil and pain which we strive to comprehend under such titles as human society and human thought.

It is only in the most general terms that I ask you to approach and consider them—and rather, therefore, in the points of their resemblance than of their unlikeness. Each surely presents itself to us as a tract over which the light has spread and is spreading very rapidly. In each the darkness has passed; in each a true light now shines. In each the spreading light has made things possible that were not possible before. In the field of knowledge thought can move more swiftly and more surely simply because the light has come. In the sphere of action, because the light has come, we can act with better hope of remedy and relief. We see more clearly what has to be done; and so our responsibilities have been and are the special responsibilities of those who have lived in regions over which, with ever widening brightness, the light has shone. Our condemnation, if we stand condemned, is the condemnation of those into whose world the light has come and they have not loved it.

1. The conflict between the Church and natural science is rapidly passing into ancient history. There is hardly any conflict left. Yet here it is instructive at least to cast our glance backwards and see, if we can, how we behaved when the new light of exact physical science began to separate the night and bring back the day, and reveal the order and unity of God's working in the natural world.

Of course there was unsettlement, of course there was distress; there were the pardonable faults of those who love the familiar and distrust the new. But how easily, how fatally we slid into that for which there was less excuse. Can you not

remember our passionate tenacity for that which was demonstrably untenable? How little pains we took to understand. How little appreciation the Church showed for the characteristic power and excellence of the scientific mind. There was the ecclesiastical ignoramus with his contempt for the sure and patient work of scientific research. There were indeed the honest souls, who held, as it were to the death, the posts which they believed that God had assigned to them, and guarded what they believed to be essential truth with the whole force of passionate loyalty. May they rest in peace: but all along and side by side with these were souls less honest and less sincere—contemptuous, self-satisfied, embittering the conflict with their angry words, with the thin veil of zeal for God barely concealing their infinite confidence in their own opinions.

The scientific temper has found its way into religion. We are learning more and more to admire its patience, its candour, its passion for certainty, its readiness to surrender what is disproved, its clear distinction between what is probable and what is sure. It has taught us more than we can express. But has the past no cause for shame and for self-humiliation? You remember, perhaps, the picture that has been drawn of some insignificant mediaeval council sitting through the weary length of a hot and somnolent afternoon, its members just awake enough to repeat *damnamus* at the close of the propositions they were met together to condemn. It is no doubt a caricature, an exaggeration of the attitude of the Church towards dawning truth, but it is a terribly true picture of the way in which men are apt to deal with propositions they are too indolent to investigate and understand! That conflict, may be, is almost over. The oppositions of faith and science, in its proper sense, have ceased; but the same intolerant and intemperate spirit is at work in other departments of human thought. Let us make no mistake; there is a true beauty in a man's loyalty to that which God has made real and vital and precious to his soul—the truth that has lifted him above himself towards God, the truth which has been tested in the daily experience of the spiritual life. I know, says St. Paul, whom I have believed.

But has our loyalty been—is it—of this sort? is it really part of the love of God? Is it really the zeal of His house that has eaten us up—the reproaches of them that reproached Him that are fallen upon us? Or was it ignorance, prejudice, pride, sloth, holding the fort, not for God, but for self—not for His glory, but for the threatened credit of our own self-esteem?

2. And so, too, with that other sphere of which we are bidden to think to-night; "The Church and Human Society." Here, too, we have a vast tract over which, of late years, the light has been spreading fast: and as it spreads it explains, it condemns, it points the way to effective action, to remedy and to relief. It shows us human life as a solid and continuous whole, bound up

and knit together in the unity of a single existence, each human atom in real and effective contact with each other, however distant it may be. We begin to feel our infinite responsibility, before God, for all that we have and are. Nothing can relieve us of it. Poverty, misery, the crippling cruelty of utter disadvantage are not things that lie apart from us, the mere accidents of a condition unlike our own. We can no longer pity them from a safe distance, or sympathize through the stalls, or toss them the halfpence of our charity across the street. Slowly, but quite surely, in a thousand ways, their misery is shown to result, not from personal demerit, but from a strange and vast disorganization of social life, which Christ's law, heard and obeyed, alone can readjust.

There is our shame, there is our sin. Whoever would have dreamed in the days of the first love that a Christian nation would stake out so small a claim for Christ as to leave almost the greater part of social life clean outside it, and to forbid Him by whom all things were made to teach us how all things should be managed? Thank God for the courage and the insight which, to-day, in a new sense, like St. Paul, are preaching the gospel, where Christ at present is hardly named; in regions where chaos prevails, because as yet the Spirit has not moved on the face of the waters; anarchy, for Christ does not yet rule. Forgive us, O Lord, our dreadful positive language, our cheap sarcasms, our contempt for the labours of other men. Forgive us when we preferred that thy book should remain closed rather than that hands we disliked should open it to us. Forgive us when we have shirked the labour of clear thought and spent our strength in blind resistance.

Forgive us, O Lord, our disloyalty to Thy dawning light: our persistence in what conscience was beginning to condemn; our worse persistence in that which we knew to be forbidden; our content with our own comfort; our indifference to the sufferings of Thy other children. And now, O Lord, turn Thou us, and we shall be turned. Show the light of Thy countenance and save us for Thy mercy's sake. Teach us to do the thing that pleaseth Thee, for Thou art our God. Let Thy loving Spirit lead us forth into the land of righteousness.

Prayers having been offered, the BISHOP OF GIBRALTAR delivered an address on "The Church and Human Society". Other worldliness, he said, had a great deal to answer for. There was a tendency to take it for granted that this world and the other world were two separate things, and had nothing to do with one another, and that religion had to do with Sunday, the time when we were on our knees, and had nothing to do with the ordinary things of this everyday world of business. In all regions of life we were told that men found it very hard to bring their religion into touch with their ordinary everyday life. That, however, was

largely based upon a misunderstanding of one or two particular teachings of our Lord, teaching of such a kind that only those who were willing could misunderstand. Our Lord's words, "My kingdom is not of this world," had been taken by people to mean that there was another world other than this altogether, having nothing to do with ordinary everyday life, and that our Lord was concerned with that alone; and they allowed themselves to put out of their minds the fact that our Lord's kingdom is not of this world only because it is greater than and includes this world and every other world.

The cure for other worldliness was simply to recognize the fact that every part of human life belonged to our Lord already. Politics in the pulpit had become a by-word. No wonder that it had come to stink in our nostrils as we looked back over years and years during which party politics had been preached in the pulpit, over years and years during which the opinions, now of this party in power, and now of that party in power, were put forth. There was, however, a real and true place for politics in the pulpit, for Christian politics; everything which had to do with the life and state of society must ever be in place there. Our Lord's kingdom had its rules, and we could not be faithful servants unless we studied and tried to apply them. Whatever our occupation, it was part of that life of Christ's kingdom. Every part of it came within the realm of Christian politics, and was subject to the law of Christ.

There were two ways in which that moral law affected mankind as a whole. First we recognize it in word; then in deed. (1) None doubt that He who said, "Thou shalt not steal," was stating that which was binding upon us all. Public opinion was clear and decisive with regard to every part of the moral law stated boldly, plainly in the abstract. The Church ought to have a similar public opinion which stated clearly and decisively without any doubt at all what a Christian man ought to do. It is one thing to be perfectly clear about the law, and another thing to obey and carry it out; but we ought to be quite sure that there is an applied law which is binding upon each one of us, and which in all our several relations we are bound to try and obey. It was self-denial which made men ready to face death for the common cause; and was it not that willingness to be witnesses, martyrs? We needed the spirit of martyrdom in business, which will bear whatever might come rather than be unfaithful. A strong and clear public opinion needed to be formed. Christian society ought to speak definitely and clearly in a number of ways which one could easily think of if one tried. At one of the recent Lambeth conferences a conclusion had been arrived at that Christian society ought to make it a definite rule that it would not admit to itself a man who was known to be living an immoral life and was not penitent.

(2) But, after all, the great thing was not Christian public

opinion acting upon those without by what it said, but by what it did. The final thing to consider was, are we all trying to live our life with the recognition that every part of that life is really part of the kingdom over which our Lord Jesus Christ is King? Could there be any doubt as to the answer of that oft debated question, "Am I to make the object of my life myself and those belonging to me, or am I, first of all, to think of my duty to all men?" if once we realized that every one of our worldly duties was really part of our work as subjects of the Kingdom of Christ? It was the duty of the strong to minister to the weak. Our duty was first towards society; towards others, and not towards ourselves. Could we justify ourselves in making use of things that were made by those who were badly paid? Could we justify ourselves making money by the labour of those who were not receiving a sufficient pittance upon which to live? Could we say that we were not corporately responsible for the condition of the poor and wretched around us? When once we recognized the fact of our fellowship in the common family of Jesus Christ all those relations would be altered. In conclusion, he desired that every one present should, if they had not already done so, take the earliest opportunity of studying the Report of the Upper House of the Convocation of Canterbury on "The Moral Witness of the Church", published by the S.P.C.K., and endeavour to apply it to their own daily lives.

The Litany was then said.

The BISHOP OF NEWCASTLE, New South Wales, spoke of "The Church and Human Thought", or, as he should prefer to express it, "Divine Thought and Human Thinking"—for we do not want to have the Church set up over against human thought as if it did not think itself or was afraid, in any sense, of the process of thinking. If we believe in God at all we must believe in Him as the one Fount and Origin of all Life and Energy, whether physical, moral, mental, or spiritual. Revelation and Theology will necessarily be related, though they will not be the same thing, because God gives Himself to us by degrees as we are able to apprehend Him. We want to remember that the one Theologian the world has ever seen is Jesus Christ, who came to us with the one authoritative Word about the eternal and invisible God. Yet, even so, we only apprehend Jesus Christ as the Holy Spirit of God helps us; and so thinking, must go on within the Church.

And wherever there is thinking, there is room for variety. We must not be afraid of it, and we must not get into the habit of thinking that creeds came without or apart from thought; for creeds represent the crystallized thinking, the freest thinking the world ever saw, and nearly three centuries expressed, in the grandest language for dialectic the world has ever known. We have never been afraid of thought or thinking, and, please God, we never shall. But what I suppose we want to know when we

come to a Congress is, Have we any reason to be afraid to-day of modern methods of thinking? Need we be afraid of what is called modernism? Well, we cannot help being moderns; we will get over that if the world lasts long enough. In time we shall be looked upon as mediaevalists, and I expect the men of those days will not think very much of us. We criticize others. Oh, that we could see ourselves not only as others see us, but as subsequent ages will see us! It might take the conceit out of us, which would be a good thing. That, at any rate, we can spare. I hope there will be something left when the process is finished. We need not be afraid of any phrase of that kind. What we want to do is to be humble moderns, to be brave moderns, to be loyal moderns; and not to think that modernism means finality, because it does not. Finality is with God; transitions in thinking with us. Let us be humble, honest, and do our best.

Now if we look to-day there are some things to encourage us and some to make us a little bit troubled. That is a good thing, because it is not wise to be too self-complacent. I suppose of modern thinking one thing that disquiets us is the loose way in which the term "evolution" is used. It is used rather like that blessed word "Mesopotamia", without people taking the trouble to think what it means. It is supposed to do things. We hear people say that evolution *does* this, or *does* that, as though it were only the name of a process, not in the least degree a description of an energy. Now what comes of that? We have a lazy sort of way of thinking that things will necessarily come right. Things do not come right; they go wrong as often as they come right. You and I have got to put them right, and that is what we are here for. And if we lazily think that things will come right, we dishonour God and fail in our mission. From this necessitarian view comes an indolent sort of spirit which thinks, "Oh, do not let us trouble; religions, the philosopher says, are equally false." But who is the philosopher? If man makes himself the philosopher, that is not quite wise, is it? The world is full of self-made philosophers. And then they go on to say that all religions are equally false, and, then, that they are all equally useful. They are no good at all, then. Passing by the fact which Gibbon's book proves, that the last word should have been useless, it is a grim thing when men appoint themselves philosophers. And yet there are many such. That is what the whole of his book shows,—that when religions pass out of being and enthusiasm they are no good to anybody. So, a lack of enthusiasm is, perhaps, a danger to thought, and the most perilous danger to thought is that view of pain which makes pain the greatest evil, instead of finding that evil is the most deep-seated pain. We want to get rid of that terrible way of thinking; we have to fight against it.

On the other hand, surely, there are some good things to remember. In the first place, there are notes of earnestness to-day which constantly surprise people. If anybody five years

ago had asked whether there would have been gathered for prayer such a crowd of people here in London, I venture to say that the reply would have been "No". The eagerness, the energy, and the deep, real, religion of the world gives the lie to the cynic. There is far more religion in the home, in the life, and in the city than people know. Then, too, men talk about what is called psychology, which is not much more than a new word for a new method applied to an old subject. It tends to show that the seeds of a man's religion are in himself, even if the sun of his religion is above him, and the influences which nurture religion are from without him. It proves, again, the truth of the old saying, "If God were not, it would be necessary to invent Him." Another thing is that we hear a great deal about other religions, what we mean by comparative religion. First, men thought lightly, then they were inclined to praise; now they are studying, and studying is always the best thing. We find that while there is much that is good, of course all thinking, where it is true, is part of God's thought. There is only one God, and all energy and rightful thought is from Him. But now we begin to see how much there is that is cruel and imperfect, and what a sadly imperfect commentary on the Cross of the Lord Jesus Christ other religions are. We do not think less of them, we learn to think more of Christ. So, too, men will tell you that conduct is the most of life, but they find out that faith has a very great deal to do with conduct, and it is not enough to say that conduct is good to arrive at it. Civilization and progress has its ghastly failures. We want religion again. As Mr. Chesterton once said, in the ordinary events of everyday life, the most important thing to know about a man is what is his philosophy, that is, his relation to the sum of all that is, and the sum of all that is, includes a great deal that we cannot see; and to stand in true relation to the things we cannot see is faith, the evidence of things not seen.

And so, lastly, human thought is learning, the universality of faith. We used to speak of faith as though it were a sort of ornament of religion, while religion was an occasional ornament of life. That will not do. An ornamental religion leads to the child's definition of faith, which is believing what is not so. And that is not what we want, is it? What we learn is that faith is the necessary base of all knowledge, that absence of faith, or refusal of trust means universal nescience; and because the world will know, thank God, therefore the world, doubly thank God, must believe. Faith is the condition of knowledge, always, everywhere, and that is one of the contributions of modern thought. And when we come to look at facts, have we any reason to be afraid? Scripture has been criticized like any other book, with the result that we all know that there is no other literature like it. Jesus of Nazareth has been tested, tried, criticized, as no other man ever was, and we know, as the result, that He stands unapproachable in majesty, in character, "chiefest among ten

thousand, and altogether lovely." And if our thinking leaves us Christ, and Christ shows us God, and the Holy Spirit teaches us to be brave, honest, fearless, all we want is not to give evidence for miracles, but to work miracles as evidence. That is what the early Church did. And we are gathered in this Congress in all humility, I trust, waiting on the eternal God, asking Him to quicken thought, to inspire enthusiasm, to give conduct, to enable us to go forward in the strength of Christ and prove His truth by showing the reality of His mission in and through us.

The hymn commencing "Sweet Saviour, bless us ere we go" was then sung, and the service was brought to a close by the pronouncing of the Benediction.

MARRIAGE

SPEECHES AND DISCUSSIONS

MARRIAGE IN CHRISTENDOM

ALBERT HALL. TUESDAY MORNING, JUNE 16

THE BISHOP OF MONTREAL presided on Tuesday morning, June 16, at the Albert Hall, over the opening meeting of Section A, which dealt with the general subject of "The Church and Human Society", the special matter for consideration being "Marriage in Christendom". After the opening office consisting of the Apostles' Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and a few prayers said by the Rev. Dr. T. C. Fry (Joint Hon. Secretary with the Rev. J. Carter for the Section A. meetings), and followed by the singing of "The Church's One Foundation", the Chairman at once called on the Rev. Canon Norman L. Tucker (Canada) to start the discussion.

CANON TUCKER, General Secretary of the Missionary Society of the Church of England in Canada, said he felt alarmed at having to set the ball rolling in such a vast room and before such an awe-inspiring audience. He had one comfort in the thought that he did so under the presidency of a bishop who had been the friend of a lifetime, and under whom he had laboured for so many years in the Diocese of Montreal. What could he say satisfactorily in a quarter of an hour? He could only take one feature of the subject and present it to the best of his ability. If he was to speak for his own country as distinct from others, he would say that marriage held an honourable place in the Dominion of Canada among a highly moral people. Yet there were influences at work arising out of the growth of large cities and the overcrowding of population that were producing undesirable results. Marriage with a deceased wife's sister, though allowed by the State, was not allowed to be celebrated by any of the clergy of the Church, and divorce was almost unknown. But the great influx from the United States, where the facilities for divorce were far too great, might tend to alter the whole attitude of the Canadian people. There was no ground for alarm, but no reason for special gratification. The question before them at that critical growing formative period of their national life should engage the serious attention of all well-wishers of the empire. It was a fortunate circumstance that here they might deal with a concrete institution and not merely an abstract principle. All knew the value of an ideal as an uplifting force in human life; and what greater ideal could they have than that of the home? But home was more than an ideal; it was a great reality. All that was

best and most unselfish was brought into play in a well-regulated home—all the most potent and enduring influences that went to form character and life. The great need of the nation, the empire, the Church, and the world in the twentieth century was that of men of principle and character. All other needs compared with this were of secondary importance, and the best agency under God for producing such men was not the School and the University, however good, but the Christian home, under the fostering care of the Christian Church. The union of one man and one woman in a life-long relationship for the raising of worthy citizens for both earthly and heavenly service, offered the highest ministry to which any human being could be called. It was one that should be fostered and protected by all the means that lay in the power of Church and State. He was convinced that the Pan-Anglican Congress would do its best work by keeping its eye on the fundamentals of the subjects with which it was dealing, and that the Anglican Communion could not set its hand to a higher task than that of fostering and protecting the Christian home.

The BISHOP OF ALBANY expressed himself in cordial agreement with all that had fallen from his Canadian brother, but he hoped that, instead of the United States corrupting Canada, Canada would correct the United States. He was absolutely certain that there was no subject of more intimate and intense importance to the whole human race than insistence on the original definition of marriage as in the Creation story, which, whatever theories they might hold about it, seemed to him a relation of facts infinitely more mystical than mythical. Marriage as instituted and ordained of God in man's innocence, meant the cleaving of one man to one woman. Christ did not institute marriage, but took it up and adorned it as he did everything else. With regard to the exception to the law of the indissolubility of marriage mentioned in St. Matthew, the bishop expressed his conviction that coherence and consistency and further critical study demanded its being regarded as an interpolation. They had fallen on evil days in the United States, where they were confronted with two forms of polygamy—the synchronous, in Mormonism, and the successive in remarriage after divorce. The bishop indicated, however, signs of reaction from, and revolt against, the prevailing laxity in the attitude and action of the Churches, mentioning the emphatic insistence of the National Council of the Congregational Churches, in its report on the subject last year, on the impossibility of the Church sacrificing its conscience, and the good work being done by the Inter-Church Conference on Marriage and Divorce. This Society, of which he was President, and which was representative of twelve religious bodies, had agitated successfully against the facility for and frequency of divorce. They had reached and influenced representatives of forty-one out of the forty-five States to recommend what some Legislatures had

adopted, laws restricting the number of recognized causes for divorce. In New York State there is only one ; in South Carolina there is none. They were pressing the Legislatures to reduce the number of causes at the highest to six. Now they are turning to the root of the matter, and in their last address made this appeal : "The time seems ripe, right now, to make more radical and rousing effort, recognizing what is true, that the relation of the Church to marriage is neither to effect it nor to legalize it, but only to sanction it in the name of Jesus Christ." The Conference believes that the Christian Church ought not to content itself with merely exercising or withholding discipline after the marriage has been entered into ; not merely to say that in one case, or only in one case, or in two cases, can the person remarried be admitted to the Sacraments. The man and the woman marry each other ; the minister or other person authorized by the law acknowledges and legalizes the marriage in the name of the State. The question for the Church is, shall it give or withhold its sanction ? We would be far stronger if we took our stand here on the threshold, and declined to solemnize any marriage but that which carries with it the fundamental and essential thought of the one man and the one woman till death them does part. The question is not one of admission to or exclusion from the Sacraments of the Church, under the laws of discipline of the Churches, which is a question to be decided by each religious body for itself. The important thing is that the Christian Church should be free from all responsibility as to the contraction of any marriage that can in any wise be considered questionable or doubtful, under the divine description of what marriage is, and that description is certainly in Christ's own words : "They are no longer twain, but one flesh ; what therefore God has joined together let no man put asunder."

The RIGHT HON. GEORGE W. E. RUSSELL said that this was not a subject he should have volunteered to speak about, but, when it was proposed to him, he felt it a duty to take it up. He was "a penitent Catholic, and an impenitent Liberal", and therefore an optimist ; yet on this one point he confessed himself a pessimist, in view of the lamentable signs of the times in the general relaxation of morals ; in some theories that were bringing disgrace on the name of Socialism, which, when it was the Socialism of Kingsley and Maurice, was the inspiration of his youth ; and worst of all, in the changing attitude of Christians and churchmen towards questions connected with marriage. To take a high or a low view of marriage was the real *articulus stantis vel cadentis ecclesiae*. The Church of England and the Prayer Book were not to blame. Nothing could be more explicit than their declaration that the first object for which matrimony was ordained was the procreation of children ; that a man might not marry his wife's sister ; and that it should never be lawful to put

asunder those whom God by matrimony had made one. Now on all these points there was among Church-people a lamentable tendency to compromise and concession. Was the declining birth-rate condemned? With regard to marriage with a wife's sister was the law of the Church or the law of the State to prevail? Was the remarriage of divorced people repudiated as legalized concubinage? He was there merely to reaffirm the principles that marriage was a sacramental institution, of which the renewal of the human race was the primary object; that marriage, according to its Scriptural ideal was, in Mr. Gladstone's words, "perpetual and, on both sides, single"; and that, if a man felt a Divine vocation to enter on it, it was his bounden duty to observe those salutary restrictions with which the immemorial wisdom of Christendom had fenced it round. We were, or at least professed to be, soldiers of the Cross, pledged by our *Sacramentum Militare* to a life-long conflict, not only with the world and the devil,* but also with the flesh. Could there be a more deadly treason than to reject the discipline which our Commander had ordained?

GENERAL DISCUSSION

The REV. C. J. SHEBBEARE, Rector of Swerford, Enstone, desired to emphasize one point, and that was that in these days they should be careful to avoid misstatement of the Church's law, especially overstatement on the side of strictness. There seemed a great deal of misapprehension in the minds of many clergy as to what the Church's law really was. They insisted that we ought to protest against all remarriage of divorced persons during the lifetime of their former partners, and that on the ground of loyalty to the Western Church. But this was a much stricter view than that held by St. Thomas Aquinas, by the Mediaeval Church, or by the Church of Rome to-day. Many of the marriages which are nowadays dissolved in our Courts on the usual grounds would have been pronounced null and void *ab initio* according to the old principles of Church law on the ground of deficiency of consent; and would thus have formed no bar to a subsequent union. The old law demanded a genuine *Consensus in Matrimonium*. He did not say which view was right and which wrong, but he desired to point out the divergence, and to urge that in this matter they could not decide by cast-iron formula, but by the examination of each case on its merits, trusting to the guidance of the Holy Spirit. The question was *Quid facit Matrimonium?* and not the same answer was given by St. Thomas Aquinas and the Convocation of York. The speaker referred to a case, considered by Northern Convocation, of a girl who was forced into marriage by parental authority, and to other examples in illustration of his point. They had to

remember that we as a Church must strive to commend ourselves to every man's conscience in the sight of God.

The REV. CANON BROWN, Head of the Oxford Mission to Calcutta, thought that the last speaker had raised an important point, but after all, the cases in question would offer but a small proportion of the causes for which divorce was obtained to-day. He should like it to go forth from the Congress that the Church of England as a body did hold that the marriage of a Christian man and woman was strictly and absolutely indissoluble. In the matter of a sad case which not long ago he had referred to one holding high office in the Church, he had been told that, in this view, he was merely expressing his own opinion and not that of the Church of England. He feared there had been wobbling on the part of the bishops and even of Provincial Synods. Their Marriage Service and Canons established his contention, and although provision was made for separation *a thoro et mensa*, remarriage was not contemplated. He would like the forthcoming Lambeth Conference to understand that a resolution of that assembly in approval of the remarriage in church of the innocent party to a divorce had caused deep distress and pain to a good many church-people. The Church of Rome had taken a noble stand in this matter, and in view of the moral condition to-day it was important that the Church of England should take her stand with the Church of Rome, and not allow any such remarriage under her jurisdiction and by her authority.

The REV. D. CHARLES GARDNER, California, desired to sound a practical note. Canon Tucker in his admirable paper had urged the fostering and protection of the Christian home, and that was based on the Christian idea of marriage. In California they had one divorce to every six marriages, and the question was what to do to correct this state of things. The mending or making of Canons would not effect the purpose. They must bring home by teaching and influence that the basis of true marriage is love, not the love that takes love's name in vain, but the love which comes from God.

The REV. DR. HARRIS, Vicar of Bullinghope, Hereford, said the Congress did not meet only to register opinions, but to quicken the Christian conscience and to raise the standard of life amongst Christian people. He supposed that those of either sex who were present did not come without being prepared to hear plain words. The difficult matter he had in mind had been just glanced at by Mr. Russell, as the first object of Holy Matrimony. It had become almost a commonplace in the public press to remark upon the artificial restriction of offspring. Were they to be dumb in the presence of a sin, a calculated sin of obstruction to nature, which might cost the life of the nation and which set at defiance the laws of nature and of God? Neither Church nor State could directly intervene. The only way in which the wrong could be abated and the sin made to cease was by the strengthen-

ing and deepening of Christian opinion upon it. His own experience in Australia, where he had resided for seven years, and which he recently visited again, went to show that the ignoring of what the Prayer Book tells us to be the first cause for which matrimony existed was extending among Christian people. The least of the resultant evils was the diminution of population; the future could take care of itself. It was the present degradation of humanity which concerned him most. The task of Phineas of old was not a pleasant one. Would to God that many a Phineas would rise up to-day to stay the plague of this unmanly, unwomanly, unchristian abuse of Holy Matrimony!

The BISHOP OF COLUMBIA, Canada, said he had nothing to add to what had been so ably and splendidly put before them by the last speaker. He felt that, difficult question as it was, it had been touched with a master hand. Turning to the general subject, the bishop said he was not sure they wanted to learn from the Roman Church. If we depended on "intention", we should find ourselves in a sea of difficulties. In this question, as in everything, we must endeavour to raise the popular ideal; when people came to be married we should find out whether their ideal was a high one, and in sermons constantly set before the people what ideal marriage was. With regard to their social attitude towards those who remarried during the lifetime of a partner, they would have to take a line of action that was not easy, and appear to be judges of their brethren, by refusing admission to their homes of all who thus erred.

The REV. E. C. CARTER, Vicar of St. Jude's, Whitechapel, drew attention to the opposite evil to that referred to by Dr. Harris in those who did not marry until they had given every chance for the enlargement of the race. He would only refer to it as the anticipation of marriage, and the confusion of marriage and courtship. He had first come across this subject as an emigrationist, and had found that perhaps 60 per cent. of the people who applied for "assisted" emigration to Canada were included in the disastrous category to which he referred. This evil affected both town and country, and the standard of morality could only be raised by rousing the laity to educate public opinion. This custom prevents the marriage of good girls who refuse to submit to it, facilitates seduction through promise of marriage, makes its victims afraid of religious influences, and precludes parents from expecting a high moral standard in their children. In 1905, out of 126,559 births in the London district, 4,786 were illegitimate; the cases of "too soon" children and of promiscuous and experimental intercourse escape record.

CAPTAIN JAMES PARKER, New Jersey, U.S.A., testified that, although in the States the law of the land might be in many places lax, the clergy of the Protestant Episcopal Church had stood fast for the right, and that, with rare exceptions, her clergy unanimously refused to remarry divorced persons so long as the previous

partner was alive. Let the State do what it pleased, but let the Church and the clergy set their faces like a flint against any relaxation of the Christian law of marriage.

The REV. CANON COURTENAY MOORE, Rector of Mitchelstown, Ireland, a delegate from the Diocese of Cork, said that in Ireland artificial checks on the increase of population were unknown. As regarded the remarriage of innocent divorced persons, he thought there was an inconsistency in refusing the sanction of the Church to such marriages and yet admitting those who contracted them to Holy Communion. There was a difference of opinion among the bishops, and he trusted that during the Lambeth Conference some decision would be arrived at for the quieting of conscience and for the guidance of the laity. Also with regard to marriage with a deceased wife's sister, he thought the Church should speak with a more decided voice.

In briefly closing the meeting, the CHAIRMAN said that as an old man it rejoiced his heart and warmed it with the vigour of fresh youth to hear such a magnificent conservative ring as that meeting had sent out on the question of marriage. He could not help thinking that, although no resolution could be passed, a voice so clear, distinct, and ringing could not fail to make its influence felt to the ends of the earth. The bishop added a few words about his dearly beloved Canada, mentioning that the General Synod which governed the whole of the Church from the Pacific to the Atlantic had, after two sessions' debate, practically ordered the clergy not to perform the marriage ceremony for divorced people. The decision had to come in due course before the next synod in September, to be endorsed and become actual law. That meeting, to say nothing of the growing feeling in Canada, would help to bring them all into line. The Church, so long as it was Christian, must follow Christ. There was no other leader, even if such following brought them into partial or open conflict with the State.

MARRIAGE IN HEATHENDOM

ALBERT HALL. TUESDAY AFTERNOON, JUNE 16

The ARCHBISHOP OF MELBOURNE presided.

The BISHOP OF NEW GUINEA said that marriage in the heathen villages of Papua was a purely business arrangement, devoid of sentiment and terminable at will. The union was never for a moment regarded as a life-long tie. Very rarely was it so, and when it was the case it was not considered much to the husband's credit. Prenuptial intercourse was for the most part confined to those who had made up their minds to marry, and was encouraged by the parents. Marriage itself was regarded as purely utilitarian. The marriage customs in days gone by were far more carefully carried out than they were now. These unions were very easily terminated and second unions took place very quickly. The experience of the Christian workers was that it was necessary to reconcile the two parties at once if they were to return to one another. It did not do to waste any time. The mission teacher whose great end and object was the permanence of the marriage tie, even in a marriage contracted in ordinary native life, lost no time, and exerted every effort to bring them together again. When he did so, he was said in the native language to "marry" them. They would be "re-married" in this way a good many times where the mission influence was strong in a village, for the mission teaching as to the permanence of the marriage tie was emphatic, and the Christian standard was at once set before a village when it came under missionary influence. In a village so influenced separations among married people were reduced to a minimum. The missionaries urged the careful performance of all the native customs, that were innocent, as a preliminary to the union. This was to prevent marriages being contracted hastily and without previous thought, and also to anticipate objections later on to the contract as having been imperfectly ratified. Polygamy was not at all a difficulty, and likely to die out, and marriage difficulties generally were not likely to be very formidable in Papua. The view of marriage as a life-long tie was steadily growing. The change which this higher view of marriage made in the village was great, and soon it would not be necessary when young people said that they were brother and sister, to ask "Have you the same father? Is your mother the same?" When that was so the village had gone far to abandon heathenism and to place itself under the sweet yoke of Christ.

The Rev. ARTHUR EVANS MOULE, Archdeacon in Mid-China, spoke of marriage in China. There is a new and growing tendency in "Young China" to break through the old routine and customs in betrothal and marriage, and to mimic or imitate more seriously the greater liberty and apparent reality of our Western customs.

The choice, and betrothal, and consummation are supposed to be all arranged independently of the lad and lass thus contracting. A matter of business and formal routine, it is. Courting and love-making are in the idea and ideal unknown. But the result is not so stiff and emotionless and disastrous as would be imagined. The passing of the marriage contract—the chief legal process—over, marriage follows soon, or after an interval, and the formal service over—pledging one another over a common cup of wine, and worshipping together parents and ancestors—the married life in a majority of cases is fairly happy and peaceful. And the bond is tightly drawn—it is sacred—*divorce* is base and not reputable. "Let not man put asunder." This comparative sanctity of marriage, coupled with reverence to parents and elders, must account largely under God for the cohesion and long life of the Chinese people. There are some indecorous acts and horseplay on the part of onlookers and guests at some wedding feasts; but great care is taken of the moral character of both bride and bridegroom before marriage; a very small fault on the betrothed girl's part may cause dissolution of the match. *Betrothal* is looked upon as an already legal bond, even before marriage. The money paid by the bridegroom's father for his son's wife is not so much purchase-money as dowry to be spent, it is understood, in part of the trousseau.

~ The *position of women* both before and after marriage is, however, far below the Christian standard of dignity and value. The betterment of women is one of the most hopeful items in the programme of Chinese reform. It is significant that fifty years ago the Taiping rebels at Nankin were aiming at the same goal. A wife is called "house person", a term evidently *semi-contemptuous* at least; but with a possible euphemistic sense, "Chaste keepers at home." When she becomes a mother, however, and especially of a *son*, or two, her dignity and importance in the home are much advanced; and a mother-in-law or a grandmother may become an autocrat in the home.

Polygamy is not a general custom—it is the exception in Mid-China. It is condoned only when the father has no son born by the first wife; as the continuation of ancestral sacrifices and worship, and the culture of the dead, are deemed far more important than the observance of a marriage law.* Polygamy as a luxury and just for sinful pleasure is generally condemned on moral grounds. Two cases (it is to be feared but two out of many) were related to illustrate the uncertain state of morality even far away from a foreign port.

The question of the *remarriage of a widow whose husband has been long absent* without news and without any apparent cause save accident and death, and the possibility of *Enoch Arden's* return, is treated in China much as in England. Such marriages seem to be permissible

after a minimum of three years' absence and silence—but at the risk of the parties concerned; the law assents, but will not protect should the lost husband return.

The Church must thankfully recognize China's reverence for marriage, but must elevate it to the Christian ideal, by the sober and wholesome betterment and education of women (the human side and motive), and by lifting men and women to Christ in His Church, that "mystic union". The Marriage Service of the English Church is in the main suitable to Chinese thought and custom, but some details will probably be modified and some added by the Chinese Church so as to recognize what is reasonable in national and social custom, while abjuring all that is superstitious and unchristian.

The REV. J. T. IMAI, Principal of the Seikyosha Divinity School, Tokyo, dealt with marriage in Japan. As time will not allow me to speak of the double rites of marriage in Japan, legal and social, I must refer you for these to one of the published papers of this section, and go at once to the inner meaning of our social idea of marriage.

The characteristic feature of Japanese society is that of the family and not of the individual. The family was and is the entity of the national life, and individual interests or personal choice are expected to be sacrificed at the altar of the family. Patriotism and loyalty are nothing more nor less than the higher development and larger application of this idea. The sum total of national and domestic ethical ideas is to be found in this fundamental doctrine of family. There is no honour, right, or duty which does not find its highest meaning in the relationship to the family and its ancestors. The family is therefore conceived of in a different light from what it is in the West. If I understand rightly, a family in the West begins with husband and wife, but in Japan it is the parents that originate a family. The parents therefore occupy the most important place in a family life, in which brothers and sisters are included so long as they are not separated to start a new home.

Now the principal idea of marriage is to be gathered from this family system. It is considered as an essential part of family duty rather than a matter of personal choice. The husband and wife get married for the family, and its highest representatives, the parents, claim this duty of them in the name of its ancestors. Personal choice on the part of people to be married is desirable but by no means essential for matrimony. Love and confidence are considered as natural outcomes of faithful loyalty to the family rather than as the causes of such mutual obligation. The man marries as an important duty to continue his family lineage, the woman marries because it is her highest duty. If you collect as many school rules as you can from the existing Japanese girls' schools you will find, with very few exceptions, that the school is instituted in order to bring up "good mothers and wise wives".

The marriage is contracted with slight or no personal knowledge of each other on the part of the persons to be married, except that he or she is made aware that the other has qualifications fitted for the family, and belongs to a family suitable in social position and family traditions, having no hereditary disease, and is in good health with an agreeable personal appearance. And however puzzling or almost ludicrous it may seem to Western minds, practical results generally prove that happier and better homes are produced by the marriage for duty than by so-called "love matches".

The virtuous Japanese marriage is then for duty rather than for choice. In former days the bride was seen off from her parental home in a festal but serious and solemn manner, and in Samurai families a dagger was given as a gift to be the last resource when her matrimonial duty or virtue could only be fulfilled by death. The old customs are undergoing changes, but the idea remains the same.

And as with marriage so with divorce. The simple fact that she is not fitted to the family is even now counted reason enough for the separation of man and wife when the parents or near relatives agree in not being pleased with the unfortunate lady. Even mutual attachment is required to be sacrificed in the name of the family. The law would protect in such cases if appealed to, but very few would dare to go to law to secure their personal satisfaction against the pressure put upon them in the sacred name of the family.

It is a matter of no slight interest to notice that nowadays some marriages are celebrated at shrines or temples with a religious ceremony. The leading non-Christian Japanese are beginning to realize that the sanctity of marriage cannot be properly emphasized unless religion comes into it. And many are ready to acknowledge that there can be no better religion than Christianity in this respect.

I now pass on to difficulties and problems for the Church in Japan. And I should like to say at once that Christianity, which is *the domestic* religion of all the creeds in the world, has in Japan come into special contact with the strong natural idea of family. The revealed name of "Heavenly Father" finds intelligible echo in people's minds, however their ideas of "God" are confused by polytheistic habits of thought.

Now it is obvious that marriage between Christians must be life-long. But must we therefore destroy the idea of family duty connected with it? Can we not rather consecrate it in the name of Christ? The present Marriage Service of the Japanese Church is simply a translation from the English Book of Common Prayer, completely individualistic in its form. Could not the highest and noblest ideas of family and of the duty owing to it be somewhat emphasized in the Japanese Service from the revealed truth of the Fatherhood of God over the whole Universe of His Creation?

Yet it is extremely difficult to suggest the details of such alterations. Marriage, and even divorce, carried out in Japan from the family basis cannot be so easily condemned as would appear at first sight, and yet we cannot acquiesce in applications of its principle as far as divorce is concerned, if we are to be faithful to the truth we are to witness and preach. The Nippon Sei Kokwai has debated a Canon on Marriage through several triennial General Synods. But each time heated debates in the Synod or careful consideration at special committee meetings have ended in throwing out the drafts laid before the House. The real difficulty is in the under-current which runs strong in Japanese minds, influenced for generations by their national family idea, and which Western minds cannot quite enter into. And I feel that till the family side of the Christian truth can be more drawn out, built up, and consecrated, we shall not be able to come to any satisfactory conclusion. Till then it may be best to leave the Canon as it is.

Another of our practical difficulties is the question of marriage between Christians and non-Christians. It is sadly frequent, owing to the fact that Christians are so few in number in proportion to the whole population. The difficulty is greatest in the case of Christian girls belonging to non-Christian families of the higher classes, and it is unavoidable while marriage is considered a matter of duty in which personal choice is expected to be sacrificed. And in Japan, even if personal choice is granted, to live unmarried would cause serious scandal. A girl would have no provision for her livelihood even in good class families, where daughters are not generally provided with special property of their own.

The cases of Christian and non-Christian marriages are considered to be cases for discipline, and to be referred to the judgement of the Diocesan. But many cases are not brought to his notice, and the judgements vary in different dioceses. I need say nothing on the side of the opinion which would have all such cases put under discipline, as I trust it is the common opinion in the West, but it will be of some interest to say a few words on the other side. The opinions of those who would not bring these cases under discipline may be represented as follows. They think the so-called heathens are not the same as those of past ages. Though not Christians they are sympathetic and favourable to Christianity, neither definitely atheistic nor believers in a heathen religion. They are often willing to have the marriage in church, but the Church cannot, of course, consent to this, and therefore the marriage is celebrated according to old custom. They are only inspired with antagonistic feelings when they find the Church taking so much trouble to prevent the marriage, and, when it is carried out, putting discipline upon their daughters or their brides. Some of the other Christian bodies generally show sympathy and goodwill to such marriages, and as a result they make converts of

the non-Christian partner and other members of the family. Again, such marriage, though it cannot receive the benediction of the Church, is honourable and sacred. Why should it be made to offend those favourably inclined to Christianity, and shut the gate of salvation before them? Or why should it cause many girls to put off their baptism in order to avoid the pains and troubles over their marriage, as to which they have no choice? Is it so essential a part of Christianity that we must ignore this inevitable necessity, and miss the opportunity of saving many through this socially honourable contract? These points may not appeal to some minds, but I think I have represented the general opinion of Japanese Christians.

Another most difficult matter at present is to receive the table of prohibited degrees as it is in the young Church of Japan. The question of the Deceased Wife's Sister is not clear even in Christian countries. It is asked whether it is one of the essential parts of Catholic doctrine or tradition, without which the Church in Japan cannot enjoy full communion. Here again I am telling you the general opinion in Japan.

The marriage difficulties lie chiefly in the divided opinions and practices among Christians in Japan. Christians have no unanimous voice in which to speak out the Christian idea of marriage and divorce. The subject really ought to be discussed and decided upon by all the existing Christian bodies if the Church of Christ is to renew and reform human society. And may I close with a hope that the Anglican Church would take a lead in wider conference on this subject as a result of this unexampled grand Congress, so that Christians of all denominations might show a united front before the world outside.

The BISHOP OF ZULULAND dealt with the marriage question as it concerned the natives of South Africa. He explained that polygamy, their long accepted custom, was dying out slowly owing to the cessation of war and the consequent readjustment of the proportion of men to women, to the loss of cattle, which always formed a part of the present given by the bridegroom to the parents of the bride, to the influence of civilization, and to that of Christianity. But polygamy would still exist for a long time, and there was much impurity connected with it. Christian discipline refused baptism to the polygamist unless he put away his wives, but this must be done with their consent and with some measure of protection provided for them. The wives of polygamists might be baptized on the special permission of the bishop for reasons given. The civil laws recognized marriage by Christian rites with penalties for bigamy in the event of further marriage, but in Natal converts already married by heathen rites could not be legally married by Christian rites. Catechumens might be married by Christian rites, and the Church's influence had introduced many reforms in marriage customs, especially in

the checking of excessive feasting. One of the special difficulties was with regard to the condition and prospects of marriage for Christian girls. Many marriages were happy and there were many good Christian homes, but they watched the future with much anxiety, and trusted they would have some guidance from the Congress on these subjects.

GENERAL DISCUSSION

CANON FARQUHAR, Sierra Leone, a native missionary, as he said, from the West Indies, where he was born, to the motherland in West Africa, opened the general discussion with an expression of gratitude for that opportunity of speaking on a question that had long occupied his mind, and on which he longed for a clear word of guidance. They in England must not think that the marriage question had been settled once for all for all people. There were varying degrees of advance in civilization to be considered, people who were no more advanced than Abraham was when he was called out of Chaldea, and yet we went to these people and expected from them the fullness of Christ. The right thing would grow, but we must have patience. He said this as one who had been completely Anglicized, and he hoped Christianized, but he found many of his West African brethren with lower ideas on the subject of marriage than he had. Discussion had been forced upon him as to the example of Abraham and David, and he found the answer in the original Divine conception of marriage and its restoration by Christ. This question had to do with a man's moral conception and growth, and they must be patient although they must put up the flag where Christ raised it, and never pull it down.

MR. C. DE B. PERSSE discussed the question of the propriety of admitting polygamists to baptism, pointing out that many missionaries of the Church of England were in favour of this being done, and quoting the change of view to which the native Bishop Johnson confesses (in a "Pan-Anglican Paper" written for another Section) from that he held when he opposed the proposal at the Wakefield Church Congress. The speaker went on to refer to another paper in the same Section in which an attack was made on Dinizulu, and to question the Bishop of Zululand on the subject, but the Chairman ruled the matter out of order.

The REV. EGERTON RYERSON, Matsumoto, Japan, said the policy of the Church of Rome in Japan in regard to marriage with non-Christians was to allow it on condition that the non-Christian party did not interfere with the religious faith and practice of the other party, and that any children of the union were brought up in the Roman faith.

As no more names had been sent up, the CHAIRMAN closed the meeting a little earlier than the appointed time, after briefly summing up the discussion. He said he could quite understand that

most of them would rather be listeners than speakers, because most had no special knowledge on the subject, or only knowledge at secondhand.

The reflection that had come to him as he listened to the papers and speeches was how intensely human it all was, and how much there was in the sanctions and motives of marriage in heathen lands that had an analogy at home. The discussion should cause us to regard the whole question and the varied customs with a new seriousness. Among the points that had specially struck him were that motherhood should be so highly honoured as such in China when very different ideas on the subject were beginning to spring up in Christian England; that in Japan the family and not the individual was the entity in social life, which was surely an expression of true Christian ideas; and that the Synod of the Church in Japan should have been debating about the marriage laws and the marriage service. The fact that they had debated on the subject was the chief thing. It was the desire of the Pan-Anglican Congress to hear voices from different parts of the world, and doubtless they would hear many voices reminding them and warning them that they could not reproduce English Christianity in all its details in every part of the world. The Archbishop regretted that there had not been more to take part in the discussion, but they felt their need of knowledge, and he himself had been content to be merely a learner.

MORALITY IN COMMERCIAL
AND SOCIAL LIFE

SPEECHES AND DISCUSSIONS

SWEATED INDUSTRIES

ALBERT HALL. WEDNESDAY MORNING, JUNE 17

The subject for the consideration of Section A at the Albert Hall on Wednesday morning was "Sweated Industries". In the absence of the Bishop of Birmingham, the COADJUTOR-BISHOP OF NEW HAMPSHIRE presided.

Before calling on the first selected speaker, the CHAIRMAN expressed his regret that he should have been called upon to occupy the chair that morning as well as in the afternoon, because it meant that the Bishop of Birmingham, who summed up the purposes of the Section in himself more than any other one man did, was prevented by sickness from being present. He was happy to be able to report improved accounts of Dr. Gore's health. His position there, as an American Bishop, might serve to show the influence that the Bishop of Birmingham exercised on the other side of the water, and that in a humble way the Chairman might claim to be one of his disciples.

MISS CONSTANCE SMITH, a member of the Executive of the Christian Social Union, said: Time was, when people honestly believed that national life could be carried on in watertight compartments. They thought that the existence, in a country, of a large class of men, women, and children, systematically overworked and underfed, stunted in mind and body, however deplorable a thing in itself, did not necessarily affect the prosperity of the other classes of that country. We think otherwise. We have learned by experience that, when St. Paul wrote "If one member suffer, all the other members suffer with it", he was not only laying down a great spiritual principle, he was enunciating a profound economic truth.

See how that truth finds illustration in our problem of this morning! Here is a mass of labour, a whole division of national life carried on under conditions degrading alike to work and worker. Here are people toiling, year after year, for wages which barely maintain existence; wages continually tending to fall lower, as the public passion for cheapness grows stronger, and competition in the sweated industries becomes closer and more cruel. And, as the wages fall, those "excessive hours of labour" noted by the House of Lords Commission of nineteen years ago as a feature of sweating, become necessarily longer and longer. I need not go into details of those hours and wages. You know them. You know, on the evidence of official witnesses who appeared before the Home Work Committee only last year, that at no great distance from this Hall there are women making shirts for 6*d.* a dozen and coats at prices varying from 5*d.* to 9*d.* each; that the

average weekly wage of a capable industrious worker in the skilled trade of brushmaking is from six to seven shillings; that all the researches of the superintending Factory Inspector of the Midlands and his assistants among the button-carders of Birmingham could not discover a woman who, even with the aid of a whole family of children, managed to earn more than 4s. 3d. a week. You know that even these poor wages do not represent net gains. From them must be deducted, for the home-worker, the cost of materials used in work, of fire, of light, of journeys to and from the factory; too often of fines and deductions out of all proportion to the worker's remuneration, and in respect of which the existing law offers no guarantee that they shall be either fair or reasonable. You know these things: they are to be found everywhere. Sweating *is* everywhere: in the smaller towns as in the great cities, in trades and places unaffected by the competition of the alien as well as in those in which his presence has helped to complicate a problem in existence before he came.

What is the result to the community? This. Whether we know it or not, whether we acknowledge it or not, we are forced, each one of us, to help bear the burden of the sweated. We bear it directly, in terms of hard cash. Forasmuch as the sweated workers cannot live on their earnings, we maintain them: by Poor Law allowances which serve as a rate-in-aid of wages, by the action of distress committees, by individual charity. We bear it indirectly, in the loss of the human capital that should have made up our national wealth of the future. There are the children of the sweated workers whose deaths in infancy are due to enforced neglect and the privation and overwork of the mother. There are the children who survive, and who must work, early and late, in the intervals of school attendance, to add a few pence to the week's meagre income. Think of these children, ill-nourished, ill-clad, undisciplined, unfitted by knowledge of any trade to earn a decent living as men and women, and then realize the future we are preparing, not only for them, but for ourselves: the recruits we are furnishing to the army of unemployed and unemployable, the lowering of the national physique, the debasing of the national intellect and character. Meanwhile, this system we suffer to flourish unchecked is serving to maintain another system, equally ruinous—the system of casual labour. The two go hand in hand.

For these things, and for their consequences, we—we as a nation—are responsible. We cannot shuffle off our responsibility on to the shoulders of one class. Our thoughtlessness, our indifference, our indolent acquiescence in maxims and systems fundamentally unchristian, have brought matters to the pass at which they stand. Do what we will, we are all, nowadays, implicated in the evil we abhor. There is not one person present in this hall whose home does not contain the products of sweated labour, some constituent of whose garments—if not the garments themselves—have not been fashioned by it. For this labour, remember, is applied to things costly and beautiful, as well as to things common and cheap. Our very rackets and tennis-balls—the toys we give our children—too often, even the

embroideries that cover the altars at which we worship, the books we open for our religious devotions, are sweated—and we do not know.

We do not know ; we cannot know. In the complicated conditions of modern trade and industry, it is impossible for us to know. This is why, as individuals, we find ourselves powerless for reform. If we would be rid of the national evil and peril of sweating, we must apply a national remedy. The awakened conscience of our people must speak with the voice of Law.

Is it not ready so to speak? We are at one in recognizing that the root-cause of sweating lies in under-payment, in the chaotic condition of industries which have no wage-standard, in the inability of the good and conscientious employer to maintain a decent level of remuneration against the undercutting of grasping and unscrupulous rivals. The House of Commons, with the concurrence of all parties, has accepted the second reading of a Bill which would confer legal sanction on minimum rates in certain sweated industries, fixed by Wages Boards composed of employers and employed—such Wages Boards as have done and are doing beneficent work in some of our Colonies. That Bill represents a great, a hopeful experiment. Shall we not try it?

There will be greater difficulty in working out such an experiment in this old country, than in those younger countries from whose example we have learned. Let that be admitted. But the cause is one in which difficulties may be—and ought to be—faced. And, if the nation still hesitates, is it not the part of the Church to encourage it? What is the Church here for, but to face difficulties, and to conquer them? Protectress of the weak, here is work to which she seems specially called. For who are the sweated? They are, in many cases, the men who have never had a chance in life, whom a poverty-stricken or neglected childhood has left weak in body or mind, incapable of conquering in the fierce competitive struggle. They are the women who fight the world unaided, for themselves or for others: the women with workless or invalid husbands, the deserted wives, the widows with young families to be supported out of their earnings, the daughters with an old parent dependent on their labour. They are such as the young widowed mother of whom one factory inspector lately gave us account, making her forty shirts between Tuesday evening and Thursday morning; or the little children under four whom another found in Birmingham, working steadily at the linking of hooks and eyes. Will not the Church come forward as the champion of these, and such as these?

They are worthy of her care. No shirking here, no attempt to "ca' canny"! Such dogged courage they bring to their task, such uncomplaining patience! And every now and then a word, a hint of capacity for higher things than the mechanical toil which claims their lives. Recently, one of my fellow workers was visiting a box-maker in Poplar, a brave woman who, by her constant labour of thirteen hours a day, supports a husband unable to work and two small children. Her room is almost destitute of furniture, save a bed and the two tables

needful for her work. But in a jug on the window-sill was the wind-broken branch of a tree just budding into leaf—the poor worker's silent tribute to the beauty of that spring she might not look upon.¹

May we see, in the fresh leaves of that spring bough, a symbol of hope for the great army of the sweated? It lies with us to make it one. If we Church people, we Christians, cared truly to deliver our country from the reproach of sweating, deliver it we could and should.

Alone we cannot do it, indeed. We must take the State with us. So much the better. Here is opportunity for the noblest kind of alliance between Church and State. The Church to inspire, the State to execute; the Church to assert the principle, the State to carry it into action. Church and State moving, hand in hand, one step nearer to that goal, distant indeed, but surely not altogether unattainable, when not this country only, but the whole of our great Empire

Shall take upon her
The law of the Christian man—in vast.

MR. G. R. ASKWITH, K.C., said that the existence and evils of "sweating" were now widely recognized, and the system was generally objected to, not only by the employed, but even by sweating employers themselves. It was time that practical schemes should grapple with an admitted evil. Religion, following the lead of Bossuet, now gave special attention to both the moral and physical improvement of the neglected. The subject was therefore especially within the province of the Congress, and as the question was national and international, countries like France and Germany having also taken it up, the world was almost united in desiring to hinder it in old, and prevent it in new countries. The principal remedy here and elsewhere, in addition to proposals for particulars lists, licensing, and sanitary inspection, all of which might be subsidiary aids, was the establishment of wages boards, or, more properly, price boards. Such boards as a practical measure could only be established by legislative interference, as the people to be dealt with had no time, money, power, or organization to move for themselves. But if legislation authorized and administered boards, they could proceed with scheduled unorganized trades on the analogy of conciliation boards in organized trades. The selection of trades by schedules would recognize that this ulcer upon society and trade is sporadic, cropping up in localities, or in varying portions of a trade, and the trade as a whole was thereby injured. The wages boards must be established from above, with voluntary aid wherever practicable, and would consist of employers or representatives of employers, and of employees or representatives of employees, with or without an independent chairman, for the settlement in conference of the minimum price or the lowest fair wage to be paid in classes of work for the work done in effecting the production of an article. According to some, the boards should be purely local; according to others, there should be a central authority, advising, directing, co-ordinating, or even overriding the local decisions. Employers as a whole were not

unwilling to pay a fair wage, provided they knew their rivals were paying the same and not undercutting them, and evasion would be hindered by the joint action of employers and employees. The middleman might suffer, but any deduction from his profits would benefit the employee and the consumer. The employee was also a consumer, and could not adequately consume unless his work received reasonable remuneration. There was no evidence that prices rose by protecting the weak in the labour market, or by every interference with the casual opportunities of the casual individual, and it was a fallacy to say that real freedom of exchange was prevented by strengthening those incapable of standing up alone, or obtaining freedom of exchange on an equitable basis. It was to the interest of neither employers nor employed to drive trade away, or seriously damage it, and by better organization more work and more regular work and distribution should be obtainable, resulting in a higher standard of comfort and self-respect. For effecting this purpose there are examples in existing conciliation boards, with statistics, particulars lists, and other machinery to copy. These boards have been able to cope with piecework price lists, seasonal rushes, changes of fashion, and minimum wages, as in the lace trade at Nottingham, the boot trade all over the country, and many other trades. Piecework statements might be complex and difficult, but they had been, and could be, made in most complicated trades. The fear of minimum wages was generally expressed by those who were ignorant that they now exist on all sides, in all classes of trade, not only in experimenting colonies, but in all parts of the United Kingdom, and enjoin payment within what the industry can bear, and beyond what is unfair and inequitable for the work done.

It might be said that wages boards were applicable only to organized trades, but the point was to effect organization, and that had actually been done already in some unorganized trades. He had himself been a party to it with the boot trade, in districts of Northants, where there were many home workers, and was acting now as assessor to a wages board for the coverers of racquet and fives balls, with the Head Master of Eton as its chairman, which was being organized by the public schools of Great Britain.

The example of those schools should be followed and extended. Voluntary workers and all the Churches could assist in finding out "sweating", and assisting in the formation of boards. There was plenty of room for work, and judicious enthusiasm was bound to have results. The collection of statistics and facts alone would be more than valuable, if only for the purpose of marking pitfalls in a path not too straight or too easy to follow, without some stumbles in the endeavour to effect organization, and to follow the wise words that "the beginning of wisdom is the desire for discipline". In actual fact the principle of wages or price boards, and their good effect, is not ideal, but possible, practicable, and likely to be advantageous as new methods lead men out of old grooves, and "the thoughts of men are widened with the process of the suns".

The REV. J. LL. DOVE, Delegate for Wellington, New Zealand, said that the answer of New Zealand was that they had no sweated industries; and the object of his paper was to show how that had been brought about. The title "Sweated Industries" was taken to exclude such occupations as clerks, among whom the evil exists to some extent. The growth of some amount of industrial "sweating" in New Zealand is indicated by clauses 28-30 of the New Zealand Factories Act 1901, which were framed to stop the evil. But this is not the only cause of the evil having ceased. The body of causes is divided into two groups, Geographical and Legislative.

1. The geographical causes are the most important and the least appreciated, and are found in the distribution and occupations of the people. To understand the distribution of the people, think first of the whole of the British Isles being peopled by the population of Durham county or Glasgow city. Then compare the grouping of the people in New Zealand with that in another new country, Victoria. In Victoria (1,200 miles away) the density of population is 14 to the square mile, in New Zealand it is 8. But in Victoria over one-third of the population is massed about Melbourne, making a city of half a million; while in New Zealand under one-third of the population is distributed in four towns of similar size and importance; and of these the largest (excluding suburbs) is Wellington, a city of under 60,000 people. Thus the people are grouped in units of small size, where "every one knows everybody else"; local public opinion is easily informed and roused to action.

Again, the occupations of the people are not mainly industrial. Newspaper reports of New Zealand legislation mostly concern industries, and so give us a wrong impression of the country. The real character of the occupations is indicated by the following figures:—

Speaking in millions of £, the annual exports of New Zealand may be called 18. Of this number wool accounts for 7, frozen meat for 3, butter and cheese for 2, and manufactures for barely 1, the remaining 5 being produce of the land.

Again, speaking in the same units, out of a total produce of industries valued at 23, those which might compete with foreign imports are about 7; and of this textiles account for 0.4 of a unit.

The country is agricultural and pastoral; the people have free access to the land and are helped by Government to find capital, and wages are high. A farmer of thirty years' experience in the North Island tells me that he has never known even unskilled labour to claim less than 25s. a week and all found. Under these circumstances it is not easy to oppress labour.

2. Passing to legislative causes, the most important is the Factories Act 1901 already referred to. In this Act a factory is described as "any building, office, or place in which two or more persons are employed directly or indirectly in any handicraft, or in preparing or manufacturing goods for trade or sale." The jurisdiction of the Factory Inspector is a wide one. In a factory there is a minimum wage and a carefully regulated time-table.

The inspectors number 22, aided by 160 local inspectors, and their work is keenly done. Further, the solitary worker is brought under the eye of both the inspector and the public by the sections 28-30 referred to. Under them the occupier of a factory has (i) to record for the inspector the name, address, and work-place of each outside worker, with a description of the work done and the pay given; and (ii) to attach, for the information of the public, to each article a label of a prescribed form. I cannot find that the label does much to enlighten the public, but the inspector's record is effective.

The second legislative cause for the disappearance of "sweating" is in the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Acts. They make it very easy for labour to organize, because they deal with any "Industrial Union", and this unit may be formed by as few as seven workers. Also they make it very easy for the "workers" to bargain with the employers. These "anti-sweating" forces, the geographical and the legislative, are kept in action by the character of the New Zealanders; and in this connexion two elements of it are important. First, there is a strong sentiment of humanity. New Zealand society is easily moved by cases of hardship. And secondly, there is not much looking before and after. New Zealanders make laws as they do other things, without much regard for the stored-up experience of history, and with little fear for the future. In fact, the organism of society is sensitive to injustice, and the response is quick and violent.

But this character is seriously threatened by materialism and secular education. So serious is the danger that the Anglican Church is trying to organize a mission of help. The conclusions are:— (i) the first remedy needed is character. People must decide that we won't have these things. (ii) The second is Conditions before Laws. Work to give houses, education (of the right sort), and reasonable access to land.

The REV. W. EDWARD CHADWICK, D.D., B.Sc., Vicar of St. Giles, Northampton, dealt with the subject of "Commercial Morality".

(A) *Principles*. The object of the Congress is "the world for Christ"; this implies every man for Christ, whatever his "calling", so the *whole* of every man's life for Christ; therefore, every action must be such that it is not condemned when treated by a Christian standard.

A large proportion of the life of all, whether rich or poor, is occupied, directly or indirectly, in buying and selling. We buy to maintain life, or to satisfy what we deem our wants; we sell our labour, or the product of our labour, or the product of the labour of others which has been bequeathed to us. This buying and selling *should* be of the nature of a just exchange.

The "way" in which we buy and sell is (a) a reflection and expression of our character; (b) it re-acts upon our character; (c) it affects the characters of others. For every monetary transaction has not only financial, but moral and social consequences.

We speak of "men" and "their circumstances", and we think that we can consider these apart, but, actually, we cannot separate them, for there is always an interaction taking place between them,

and so a mutual influence and effect ; especially the " way " in which a man uses his circumstances affects the man.

A man's " business ", the means whereby he obtains his livelihood, is a large, an important part or factor, in his circumstances. Thus the manner in which he conducts his business has a very important effect upon his own character and upon the characters of those he employs. And we must remember that the effect of business conduct (as of other conduct) is cumulative. There is an " integral calculus " of character, however, difficult to estimate.

The effects of so-called " tricks of trade " are not only financial and personal, but moral and social, even national, and wider than national. For example, " English-speaking " and " Christian " are apt to be synonymous to native races. The evil effect of the fraudulent trader lowers the reputation of Christianity and paralyses missionary effort ; it also lowers the national reputation and so the national influence.

(B) *Certain present Conditions and Evils.* (1) We cannot estimate the waste of mental (even physical) energy involved by the constant exercise of self-protection in trade ; this is especially noticeable and widely felt in countries where, in trade, " fixed prices " are not the rule. From every point of view—morally and financially—the community is injuriously affected by a want of honesty in business. A sense of honesty produces trust and encourages enterprise, and so, ultimately, benefits trade, and so the community.

(2) The evil effects of secret commissions and bribery ; and the usefulness of the Act of 1906 forbidding these, and of the " League " which has been formed to see that the Act does not become inoperative. This League deserves wide support. Probably the Act has two weak points, (a) the excessive severity of its penalties, (b) the need of the permission of the law officers of the Crown before a prosecution can be instituted.

(3) Not infrequently the buyer is to blame as well as the seller. Do we realize the far-reaching evil effects of the present rage for cheapness, and for the desire of those less well-off to copy in externals (by cheap and therefore often false imitations) those who are more wealthy? Again, do we realize the cruelties of unrestricted competition, underselling, even to the extent of crushing out " rivals " (co-existing traders) with a smaller capital?

(4) We must use discrimination, and obtain expert knowledge before we unreservedly condemn the sale of low-class articles which are cheaply produced from cheap material. These may be manufactured for a merely temporary purpose, e.g. footwear not wholly leather sold to natives in climates with a dry season and where there exist no means or opportunities for repair.

(5) What is the just value or remuneration of expert knowledge, often obtained at great cost, and at the experience of a life-time, in the " second-hand " trades—furniture, pictures, books, curios? How can we secure a fair return for the employment of this knowledge, which is different from " taking advantage " of the ignorance of the buyer or the seller?

(C) *Possibilities of Reform.* The Congress is not the time for giving details, but for asserting great and guiding principles—justice, truth, honesty; for claiming the responsibility of personal and social service in a sphere of conduct, that of commerce, in which, even by professing Christians, the paramount obligation for the application of these principles is apt to be disregarded.

A question which must be faced—how far is a fiercely competitive system chiefly responsible for these various evils? Would the mitigation, if not the abolition, of this fierce competition tend to diminish them?

Our efforts must be directed towards (a) purifying the atmosphere of commerce, (b) raising the general standard of commercial conduct to that of the best men of commerce, (c) educating the public conscience.

GENERAL DISCUSSION

The general discussion was opened by the HON. F. S. GRIMWADE, Melbourne, Australia, who said that his purpose was to tell what had been done to put down Sweating in Victoria. A Parliamentary Committee, on which he had sat, had been formed seventeen or eighteen years ago and had collected a great deal of evidence of Sweating in various trades; and the result had been legislation for the establishment of wages boards, and these boards had given a great deal of satisfaction to the forty or fifty trades that had applied for them, and a large amount of Sweating had been done away with. Unfortunately, all legislation had its defects, and in this matter the *minimum* wage had tended to become the *maximum* wage and to throw a good many of the older and less competent out of work, and so to increase the number of their unemployed. Unfortunately too, the workmen could refuse to pay attention to the decision of the Arbitration Courts when against them, while the masters were compelled to. As an employer of labour, associated with concerns that paid thousands a week in wages, he expressed the opinion that no sound and healthy man who knew a trade need ever be out of work in Victoria, and that many of the unemployed who marched in procession in winter time seeking work were hoping not to find it.

MR. MARK B. F. MAJOR, London, said they must study underlying principles, and he saw two in the commandments: "In the sweat of thy face thou shalt eat bread," and "Thou shalt not steal". The "right to work" cry was a legitimate one, and if they interpreted the second of these commandments in the spirit they would see that it carried them a tremendous way forward, being equivalent to "Thou shalt not get without giving". The crux of the whole question was that to-day the wage-earner was not economically free. The only way out of the difficulty was to give every man the opportunity of providing his own food by enabling him to return to the land.

SENATOR HENRY DOBSON, Australia, took it that the Church in discussing the question of sweating at that meeting desired

to take practical action. The speaker insisted on the necessity for the State doing everything it could do better than the individual. They must have labour bureaux and graduated labour colonies. No good would be done unless the Church took practical action. Were they going to let the Labour Party, with Materialism behind it, take the lead? Their economic laws must stand the test of the ethical law, and their Church would have to go more into politics if it meant to do anything useful.

THE REV. A. S. RASHLEIGH, Secretary of the Bristol Branch of the Christian Social Union, said that as a beginning we ought to have a minimum wage and therefore to back up the bill now before Parliament. The fact that in the richest country in the world there were men wanting work and not able to get it was due to our competitive system, and a heroic remedy was needed, and that was to be found in Socialism. No country at present had been bold enough to try the remedy, but the deepest thinkers were pointing to that solution. He denied that the Labour Party was materialistic, testifying from his own knowledge that many of its leaders were deeply spiritual men, pressed forward by a spiritual force to improve the conditions of their fellow working men. The ethics of Socialism were the ethics of Christianity. He pleaded for Socialism as the right remedy.

THE REV. A. L. LONGLEY, a Delegate from the Diocese of Newark, U.S.A., testified to what the State of New Jersey had done to remedy the evils of sweating, since the action of New York had driven the sweaters into its territory. A law had been passed prohibiting, under stringent regulations of inspection and penalty, the employment, whether at home or in a factory, of children under fourteen years of age. They were also going to pass a law placing women on a level with men in the matter of wages.

THE ARCHDEACON OF LEWISHAM felt that they ought to face the question a little more sternly than the audience seemed to have been disposed to do. They did not seem to realize the blood that underlay it and stained the conscience of us all. Interference with the system of unlimited competition was necessary if they were to do their duty. There must be a stern movement forward, and they must be prepared to throw all the enthusiasm of sentiment which belonged to charity into preventive as well as ameliorative measures.

MISS TROUGHTON, L.C.C. Domestic Subjects Lecturer, speaking as one whose experience had been gained at first hand as District Visitor, teacher, and employer, deprecated the tendency to despise manual labour and to eschew domestic service. Might they not raise the cult of dirty hands?

MISS GERTRUDE M. TUCKWELL defended women workers from the criticism of the last speaker and denied that domestic service offered a way of escape, for but a few thousand more servants would meet all requirements in that direction, while the work in many cases involved a drudgery as hard as that of any factory worker.

The speaker urged those present to study the Sweated Industries bill now before Parliament for themselves. She deprecated the jeering at unemployed processions, or at the materialism of the Labour Party, who were actually doing the work she trusted they of the Church were going to do in the future.

In briefly closing the meeting the CHAIRMAN noted one omission in the interesting speeches—that of the difficult question of the personal responsibility of holders of shares in limited liability companies. As to this and some of the other questions raised, he would use, with a slight change, the words which the Bishop of Birmingham had written in a recent work on a different matter: “It is our duty to have a permanently troubled conscience, although we cannot yet see our way.”

HOUSING AND FAMILY LIFE

ALBERT HALL. WEDNESDAY AFTERNOON, JUNE 17

The COADJUTOR-BISHOP OF NEW HAMPSHIRE again presided at the Albert Hall on Wednesday afternoon, when the subject for the discussion of Section A was "Housing and Family Life".

MRS. SAMUEL BARNETT, the first selected speaker, said it had been a wise decision of the Pan-Anglican Committee to make "Housing and Family Life" the subject of the Conference, for it was an evidence of the Church's recognition that man was a spiritual being, not only needing housing for his body but homing for his soul. And how had a Christian nation met those needs? Over 3,000,000 people were living in England and Wales in "overcrowded conditions"—that was with more than two persons in one room. In London over 330,000 persons had to live, eat, sleep, and die in one room. A medical report on the Borough of Finsbury showed that the death rate among one-room occupants was 32.7 per 1,000, while that among occupants of four rooms was only 6.6. Industrial block dwellings to remedy these conditions of housing were undoubtedly a great improvement, but of late years there had been a marked tendency to move out of them on account of the unhomeliness of the system. The alternative was the long dreary monotonous street, with the dull two- or three-storied houses on each side, the children's only playground the street. The principle by which all housing should be tested was that every house should be so planned as to make family life not only possible but joyous. To satisfy this principle three things were essential—space, light, and air; and of contributory importance were things to occupy people's minds, develop tastes, and create aspirations. As remedies, the Town-planning Bill would do much, improved locomotion more, and reduction of land cost (when it came) most. Meanwhile private enterprise was doing something, and, as Hon. Managing Director of one of the last of these enterprises, the speaker gave particulars of the work of the Hampstead Garden Suburb Trust. On this estate they were building only eight houses to the acre, with a garden to each cottage, with open spaces, and with broad tree-lined roads. Moreover, all classes would live on the estate, from the renter of a cottage to the owner of a mansion. We could not all build suburbs, or plan towns, but the Church could insist on the duty of landlords, employers, and shareholders seeing that profits did not make family life impossible. The hearth should be holy ground; it was sacrilege to destroy it. Town-

planning Bills, County Council by-laws, medical officers and inspectors were all useful, nay necessary, but it was the Spirit which alone made for righteousness, and it was for the Church to establish the reign of the Spirit.

ALDERMAN W. THOMPSON, who was introduced as Chairman of the National Housing Reform Council, and one of the greatest authorities on the subject, presented an abstract of the facts contained in his preliminary "Pan-Anglican Paper". He was particularly anxious that they should realize the magnitude of the problem that was before them, in spite of the fact that, of all the older industrial countries, we in Great Britain had the best record so far as the housing of the working classes was concerned. But the best was still bad. In the formation of a sound opinion on housing and sanitary matters, no force had been so beneficial as that of the Church of England. The Labour Party and politicians generally were not in advance of the Church on this particular question at least, and had done but feeble work in the matter, seeming to regard it as the last and smallest of those with which they had to deal. To get a halfpenny an hour increase in wages appeared to be a great thing, but to take one per cent. off the death rate of less importance. The speaker conveyed the statistics given in his paper by striking comparisons, appealing to all parts of the empire; as, for instance, that the one-room dwellers in England equalled the whole population of Queensland, and those in Scotland that of the whites in Cape Colony, while the two-room dwellers in Scotland were as numerous as the entire population of New Zealand. The consequences of this overcrowding was very serious for the nation, and all other reforms waited on this fundamental one of the housing of the people. The speaker quoted statistics to show the enormously increased death rate in overcrowded areas, and said it was a challenge to Christianity that such things should exist in our midst. It was an extremely serious problem for all of us, and there was plenty of work for all to do both corporately and individually. No legislation would be of any effect unless there was a great moral influence behind it, and to promote this was the work of the Church.

MR. JOHN W. WOOD, Corresponding Secretary of the Executive Board of Missions of the American Church, described housing conditions in New York and what had been done to improve them. The question had been complicated by three elements: the limited area of the island city, the slow development of rapid transit, and the problem of enormous immigration. Moreover, the fathers of 100 or 150 years ago had shown a singular lack of foresight. The first warnings as to the difficulties to be met were uttered seventy-five years ago, but had been unheeded, and New York went on laying up for itself a heritage of danger if not

of disaster. The first development was a type of tenement with access neither to air nor to sunlight. In 1890 an agitation was begun and New York was shocked by the disclosures made, but to the question of what was to be done was given the same answer as here, "Why, nothing!" and foremost in declaring that nothing could be done were the authorities of a Protestant Episcopal Church parish which was one of the largest landowning corporations in the city. The first step at betterment was the introduction of windows between the interior rooms and those having access to the open air, and it took three or four years to obtain even this small reform. Then provision was made that every new tenement should have access to the open air, giving rise to the "dumb-bell" type of dwelling with a narrow shaft to do duty for light and air for many of the rooms. In consequence in some degree of religious conviction, some measure of reform had since been inaugurated, and under new legislation unsatisfactory houses had been demolished and new dwellings had been erected of sound construction, having proper access to light and air and adequate sanitary provision. Two agencies had been particularly useful in this direction, the Tenement House Committee of the Charity Organization Society and the City and Suburban Homes Company, the latter corresponding perhaps to the Hampstead Trust but carrying out its work in the city itself. The speaker testified to the fact that the poor thoroughly appreciated the better housing provision that was being made for them.

DR. ARTHUR SHADWELL thought it was desirable to hear another side of the question. His purpose was to protest against some features of the present agitation about housing, both in what it expressed and what it omitted. It was too excited and relied too exclusively on a mechanical theory of life. The question was no new one, but had been ventilated and legislated upon for over fifty years, and enormous improvement had been effected. As one who had been in as many slums and had seen as wretched conditions as any man living, that improvement seemed wonderful to him, and he wanted to impress the fact on his hearers, for what could be more encouraging and hopeful? And what could be more hopeless than the common assumption that all the effort that had gone before had done little or nothing? It would mean despair if it were true. Why did so many people adopt that position or something like it? Partly because the thing was new to them, and partly because they wanted to get an emotional thrill out of it. They revelled in the magnitude of the evil, and in the glorious promise of the particular remedy which they themselves were going to apply. So they had an habitual belittlement of what had been done and an overstatement of the existing evil, frequently backed by statistics which had been out of date for years. It was a common vice with causes when they

became fashionable. The speaker denied that the bulk of our people lived in slums, properly so-called. Grime did not make a slum, nor did small houses. Smallness was a positive good; it meant that the population was spread over a large area, and open to the sun and wind, and these lines of mean and dingy streets might really be preferable to blocks of large and handsome buildings which looked infinitely better. The "spread-outness" of our towns, which was their great advantage, gave the impression of an enormous mass of poor people living in small houses, and the grime gave the impression of dreariness, dullness, and depression. To persons accustomed to different surroundings it looked dreadful, but if one got below the surface and into the thoughts and lives of the people who lived in such places, one found it was not at all dreadful to them. To call for the description of "slum" at least three of the four "D's" must be present: dirt, darkness, damp, and dilapidation. Because he laid stress on improvement, the speaker did not deny the need for more, but rather found in the one the best hope for the other. Before they got rid of the worst housing abuses, they must have honest administration of the law, and it was therefore necessary to uphold the law of duty and keep conscience alive. In conclusion, Dr. Shadwell pressed home two lessons: that the best compromise between cheapness and goodness in house-building was secured by the minimum interference with the open market, compatible with the maintenance of a decent standard, and that in trying to advance the standard of housing and of the house we must not lose sight of the moral factor, the habits of the people.

GENERAL DISCUSSION

MISS CONSTANCE COCHRANE, Croxton, urged that in rural districts no question stood in greater need of solution than that of healthy housing, and that none was confronted by so many difficulties. Indeed the extent of the difficulty was such that, when contemplating it, churchpeople and many other Christian men and women altogether lacked the courage to face it, forgetting that the greater the difficulty the greater must be the effort to overcome it. The speaker denounced the excuse "cottage property does not pay". Was it not the first duty of the owner and the employer to secure that those who cultivated their land should do so under conditions which would make health, decency, and contentment more possible? It was the part of the Christian Church to attack the evil at the root, and to lead men to a greater simplicity of life, and a deeper sense of brotherhood.

Mr. LUKE M. HILL, City Engineer and Town Superintendent of George Town, British-Guiana, said that in that city they had a very mixed population of 60,000 people on 1,500 acres, an average of forty to one acre. So they were not overcrowded. Twenty-five years ago building regulations had been introduced

which had had good effect, but unfortunately had not been made retrospective. Recently provision had been made for divisional spaces between houses, for better ventilation, for larger floor space (150 square feet for each room being the minimum), and for the registration of ownership of tenements. Because of the flat and malarial character of the ground each house was required to be raised three feet above the earth, so that it was open to the air on four sides. The speaker trusted that the influence of this Congress would be felt not only in this country but abroad in distant lands.

THE REV. O. CREIGHTON, Curate of St. James's, Norlands, Notting Dale, was very anxious to draw attention to a state of affairs he had had good opportunity of investigating. On their way home members of the Congress might perhaps be accosted by bootlace and groundsel vendors. He knew these people in their homes—so-called furnished rooms which existed in only two or three parts of London, Notting Dale being one. A shilling a night or six shillings a week was charged for these wretched rooms containing a few dilapidated articles of furniture. These places encouraged a very undesirable sort of population. Two different experiments had been made to remedy this state of things. The London County Council had pulled down a whole street of these places, but the substituted houses remained empty because the rent was required in a lump sum weekly, and the buildings were unsuitable. Miss Octavia Hill had been more successful in buying up the dwellings and turning the furnished into unfurnished rooms, and exercising careful supervision over the inmates.

THE REV. CANON SAMPSON, Truro, dealt with the effect of housing on religion in the family life. His twenty-one years' varied ministerial career had convinced him that it was impossible to bring home the comfort of religion to those evilly housed and hampered through the lack of practical necessities. Apathy and despair and the burden of life stood in the way. As a Church, we were called to bring religious influence to bear on family life. And he was as certain as he could be of anything that they must as a Church so influence public opinion that such temporal provision should be made as God meant each family to have.

In closing the meeting the CHAIRMAN said that the whole subject seemed to him so complicated, and the problems to be solved so difficult as to call out for all that was finest and best in us. Secondly, he had been impressed by the note of hope struck. The past had brought improvement, and we now knew many facts which a few years ago were not known, and were working intelligently forward to further reform. Thirdly, it was made apparent that these questions had got beyond the power of adequate solution by voluntary effort, and that we must rouse the Government by our sense of responsibility and act through it to make the

conditions of life better. Lastly, back of all work, whether that of Government, societies, or individuals, must be the awakened individual conscience and sense of personal responsibility for stirring public opinion, influencing our immediate circle, and taking a share in any work that was going forward. Hope, responsibility, Christian effort—these were the three notes of the day.

.

THE DRINK TRAFFIC

ALBERT HALL. THURSDAY MORNING, JUNE 18

The BISHOP OF COLUMBIA presided at the Albert Hall on Thursday morning, when Section A discussed "The Drink Traffic".

The first speaker was the EARL OF LYTTON, who said that in fifteen minutes it was impossible to do more than indicate general principles as a basis for discussion. For lack of time he would assume three things: that intemperance was a serious moral and social evil, that drinking was not in itself immoral, and that it was impossible to prevent it where the desire for it existed. He submitted that a comprehensive policy of temperance reform, whether by private influence or State action, should have two clear and distinct aims: to prevent people wanting to drink, and, where the desire still existed, to diminish as far as might be the possibility of abuse. They could beyond any shadow of doubt so influence the individual, so raise the standard of self-respect, so educate and control public opinion as to diminish the desire for stimulating drink. This was proved by the better drinking habits of to-day and the higher standard of public opinion amongst the better class, and the improvement was going steadily forward and might be immensely accelerated by conscious and determined individual effort. If in every parish throughout the kingdom they had one man, or, better still, a small group of men and women banded together to promote the cause of temperance by example, by influence, and by a sympathetic association in the common life of each particular neighbourhood, the speaker believed such a revolution would be accomplished in the habits of the people, that the country would be changed beyond all recognition. This was an ideal worthy of the English Church, and the clergy and Church-workers had special opportunities in their own parishes for the realization of such an ideal. As regarded State action, he placed very little hope in Parliament except to grant the necessary powers to other bodies and the necessary funds to enable them to do their duties. He relied entirely for the future upon the action of magistrates and local experiment of different kinds, and all he would look to for legislation was the establishment of an efficient administrative machinery for carrying out such experiment as local progressive opinion might dictate. For the prevention of desire State action could only be indirect, but it might be none the less effective. It must be by entering into vigorous competition with the

publican in catering for the social needs of the people. For the prevention of abuses, the action of the State was more direct, and such action should be governed by the three objects of diminishing temptations, preventing contamination by bad example, and the penal or reformatory treatment of inebriates. In carrying out all these purposes, the supreme principle of cultivating self-respect in the individual should never be lost sight of. That, he held to be the Alpha and Omega of all temperance reform. Applying that, the policy he advocated was one which aimed at providing well constructed, well managed public-houses in such numbers only as would ensure that in each one a wholesome public opinion should prevail. In regard to contamination their first duty was to create a sound and discriminating public opinion. Not until we had an elastic system of administration unhampered either by the rights of private traders or the technicalities of the law, and a public opinion which insisted upon being protected against flagrant abuses; not until we had a temperance party with the sense to discriminate between a well conducted house of refreshment, whether to supply the rich or the poor, and a flaunting gin-palace with every demoralizing and degrading accompaniment; not till then should we make any substantial progress towards an efficient control of the drink traffic in this country.

JUDGE HERBERT S. McDONALD, D.C.L., a delegate from the diocese of Ontario, Canada, dealt chiefly with prohibition as tested in Canada, and he declared it to be unpracticable except in the way of local option applied to small areas. Upon the other side of the Atlantic a wave of prohibition sentiment seemed from time to time to sweep over sections of country more or less large. So it was some years ago in Canada, when, by very large majorities, the Scott Act was carried in county after county; but in most of them when the term of three years for which it had been enacted had expired, it was repealed; and in far the greater number—indeed, in nearly all of them, except so far as local option was employed in limited areas—the licence law was now in force. To show how prohibition had failed, Judge McDonald quoted from the report of the Royal Commission that was appointed in 1892 to make the closest personal investigation of the drink traffic in the Dominion. In North-West Canada a prohibition ordinance was in existence for some time, but could not be enforced with any fair degree of success, and the enactment was repealed. During its continuance sundry proprietary medicines containing a large percentage of alcohol were much used for beverage purposes, while sundry devices of the most ingenious kind were employed in order to enable spirits to be smuggled in. The Commissioners also gathered abundant evidence of the skilful evasion of prohibition regulations in the United States, and the impossibility in many places of enforcing

them owing to the opposition of the citizens. In conclusion, the speaker quoted the words of one, now a bishop of the Church of England in Canada, in reference to the principle—or lack of principle—underlying a law which prohibited the manufacture, importation, and sale of liquor for beverage purposes: “I do not think it would be a wise or workable law. I do not think it is founded on those principles of eternal wisdom and of long experience which have dictated the laws of past nations. I do not find that the principle underlying such laws enters into the Divine law nor into the great human codes that have governed the largest and the oldest nations of the world. . . . I think the great principle of law is not to put it absolutely out of the power of a man to do what is wrong, but to strengthen him to resist temptation to do the wrong.”

The BISHOP OF KENSINGTON, premising the necessity for immediate reform in the drink traffic, set himself to answer the following questions: What are the safest and surest methods of reform? What are the aims and ideals of temperance reformers? What should be the attitude of the Church towards them? Without under-estimating the value of personal influence on the individual—having for fourteen years presided over the temperance work of the diocese of London, which depended primarily on the personal touch—the Bishop said we could not trust what is called temperance work to effect reform of the drink traffic. They must have legislative reform. But the temperance reformers as a body did not aim at total prohibition (the campaign for it had failed in this country, and would, he believed, always fail); did not seek to make everybody a total abstainer, or recklessly to condemn the moderate drinker; and did not try to cover the trade with abuse or contempt, or to suggest that those engaged in it were deliberately engaged in wrong-doing. No! he submitted that the distinct aims before the great body of thoughtful temperance reformers to-day were: (1) the reduction of drinking facilities, a considerable reduction, and one as rapid as was consistent with justice and one on a legal, uniform, and equitable basis; (2) complete control of the liquor traffic by the State; (3) to clear the air that the voice of the people might be heard, that the will of the people might be felt. After all, this was the people's question. It was not a question primarily for the classes, it was a vital one for the masses. The prosperous folk in a community would take good care of themselves. They would not allow a public-house to be dumped down within reach of their own residences; but the people had no voice, and the highest aim we had was to give them a voice. Statesmen had said they ought to have it. The Church had said they ought to have it. What else *could* the Church do, unless she abdicated her position as the champion of the best and highest interests of the people; unless she were content to become a negligible quantity in the

forward movement of social reform which she could not stop, but might guide and lead? No timidity, no fear of losing powerful adherents, no appeals to compassion if they could only be granted at the cost of a vaster host of sufferers—none of these things should move her. She was the Church of the people; and by the people, by the happiness of their homes, by the health and innocence of their children, by all that the drink traffic was undermining and destroying, the Church of the nation must stand.

The REV. HAROLD ANSON, Delegate for the Diocese of Auckland, said that in the Dominion of New Zealand the law allows to the electors the opportunity of local option in regard to the continuance of licences for the sale of liquor. Parliamentary elections are held triennially; at every parliamentary election every elector has the opportunity of voting on the question of the continuance of licence within the parliamentary constituency in which he or she resides. The vote is taken at the same time and place as the parliamentary vote. The questions on which the elector votes are as follows:

1. Whether the number of licences existing in the district shall continue.
2. Whether the number shall be reduced.
3. Whether any licences at all shall be granted.

The voter may vote for one or two of these proposals, but no more. In order to carry "Reduction" or "No Licence" a three-fifths majority of those voting is necessary, and the same majority is necessary to restore licences where they have once been abolished.

If "No Licence" be carried, the manufacture and sale of liquor within the parliamentary constituency is prohibited, except that persons may order liquor for their own private consumption, the particulars of the purchase being registered by a public official. Clubs are under restrictions similar to those which govern licensed premises. The object of the "No Licence party" is not so much to prevent the consumption of liquor as to prevent its sale and purchase at public bars, and the majority of the party are content to acquiesce in its private purchase by individuals, under adequate restriction, for domestic consumption.

The total vote for "No Licence" within the Dominion has increased from 98,312 in 1896 to 198,768 in 1905, an increase of over 100,000 votes out of a total of 396,417 votes recorded.

The vote for "Continuance" has increased during the same period by only 43,304 votes, rising from 139,580 to 182,884. Thus through the whole Dominion, in 1896 the majority in favour of "Continuance" was 41,268, in 1905 the majority against "Continuance" and in favour of "No Licence" was 15,884.

In 1905 there was an absolute majority of votes recorded in favour of "No Licence" in 39 licensing districts out of a total of 68, but owing to the requirement of the three-fifths majority, in only three of these constituencies was "No Licence" carried. No constituency

which has adopted "No Licence" has afterwards voted for restoration of licence, though one constituency, Ashburton, after having, by the necessary three-fifths majority, got rid of its licences, has since polled a bare majority in favour of "restoration".

It must be noted that in New Zealand adult franchise exists, and out of the total of 396,417 persons voting, 174,743, or 44 per cent. of the whole were women. There is very little doubt that, whatever may be the other results of female franchise in New Zealand, it has a very marked result in increasing the vote for "No Licence", this being probably the only subject on which women are inclined to vote in opposition to, or at least, apart from, the influence of their male friends.

In regard to the results of "No Licence" on the moral and material welfare of the Dominion, I ought to say at once that there is no subject so keenly debated, or on which you will find among persons whose opinion you would naturally value so much debate. For my own part, I feel convinced, after giving great attention to the subject in New Zealand for ten years, that the party which has so bravely and with so much enthusiasm fought for "No Licence" has successfully established the claim of this measure as being at least one great factor in the increase of both the moral and material welfare of the community. No doubt there is in "No Licence" districts a certain amount of drinking in contravention of the law, but there is not that widespread contempt for the law which we see in England. The fears entertained by many practical persons that "No Licence" would throw a heavier burden upon the rates has not been justified. The rateable value of towns has increased *pari passu* with the increase of sobriety.

I should myself say that "No Licence" is of great value as *one* factor in the solution of the temperance problem, but only as one factor, and subject to the following restrictions:—

1. The majority in favour of it must be, as in New Zealand, a substantial one.
2. The voting area must be small and homogeneous.
3. In all probability "No Licence" will not be found to be a solution of the problem before us in the case of large towns. It will have to be supplemented by some sort of public control and management of the sale of liquor.

With these provisos, I should myself vote very confidently for "No Licence", and in spite of the cautions which I have endeavoured to enforce I should like to say here that to those incautious folk who, through obloquy and failure, and with no support from any moneyed interest, have fought so bravely and so long, New Zealand owes a very great national deliverance, and we cautious Church-folk ought to do all honour to those who have borne the burden of the battle.

GENERAL DISCUSSION

THE BISHOP OF CROYDON expressed the pain that he had felt in seeing organs of the trade rejoicing over the possibility of a split in the Church of England Temperance Society over the licensing question, but he thought at the same time the rejoicing had been a little too previous, and that every day showed the cloud which did at one time threaten was dissolving and passing away. He appealed to American and Colonial friends to help us by frank criticism of our drinking habits and by telling us what they knew by experience in their own countries to be practicable in the way of direct reforms. The Bishop also referred to the reforms that had been effected in Australia, where women had the vote, and to the terrible evil of the liquor traffic in West Africa.

THE REV. W. J. CONYBEARE, Head of the Cambridge House, Camberwell, S.E., spoke of the Club question. The working men's clubs had been admirable in origin, being started to provide themselves with recreation, instruction, and brotherly association. But the good they had started to do had been more than counter-balanced by the introduction of drink, firstly for enjoyment, and secondly for the financial support of the club. When at a recent Social Service Committee discussion, the proposal was put forward that clubs receiving more than fifty per cent. of their annual revenue from the sale of liquor should be required to come under the ordinary licensing regulations, it was objected that in that case there would be hardly one that would not be turned into a public house. There was real danger of the brewers capturing the clubs and turning them into "tied" houses, and he appealed for more subscriptions to keep good clubs going and for more personal service.

THE REV. W. J. DENZLOE THOMAS, Diocese of Washington, U.S.A., declared the law of Maine to be a helpful one, and denied the right of any man to have liberty extended to him to drag down others. The man that succeeded in a public-house succeeded in breaking down our communicants, and making men and boys unfit for the responsibilities of true citizenship.

THE REV. BARTON R. V. MILLS, Assistant Chaplain of the Savoy, objected to the assumption that we must accept the Government's Licensing Bill or dispense with reform altogether. A reasonable solution he considered was the acquisition of the liquor trade by the State at a fair market value, to be run as a Government monopoly. He maintained that the scheme was financially practicable—promising a profit of three millions a year during a time limit of twenty years—and that, if the State wanted to lessen the sale of liquor, it out to bear the loss. The carrying out of this scheme would secure all that the present bill offers, and would preserve to us the reputation for honest dealing in business that we now held among the nations.

MISS BRANDRETH, a temperance worker in South London, complained that local public opinion was not backed up by the authorities and by legislation, mentioning the case of a village which had been educated up to the point of demanding Sunday Closing by an adult vote of fifty to one, without obtaining its desire.

THE REV. DR. HARRIS, Vicar of Bullinghope, Hereford, and Hon. Diocesan Secretary of the C.E.T.S., said that many things which we were assured could not be done were matters of fact in Australia. He appealed to all his fellow Churchmen, but especially to those in Holy Orders, to take up the temperance question seriously and earnestly, and to try and find out what the problem was and the way to meet it. They must not think it was not a subject of intimate concern to all Christian men. There was great need for reform in the rural districts.

THE REV. J. ANDERSON ROBERTSON, St. Mary's Cathedral, Glasgow, said he ministered in the worst slum district in Glasgow in a mission founded by the Bishop of Kensington. In the Cowcaddens quarter he, with others, one Saturday night counted no fewer than thirty-four men and women helplessly drunk on one side of a short street, to say nothing of those on the other side and in the centre. He had worked as a medical man for twenty-five years, and had found that the one and only question in the slums was the drink question. In every instance of investigation into dire poverty which he had made he had found that it was due immediately or remotely to this cause. He appealed for the example of abstinence to be shown to others, and especially that the clergy should be total abstainers.

THE BISHOP of UTAH considered that prohibition had not had a "square deal" that morning. It was true that waves of prohibition interest swept over the States, but every wave was stronger and higher. There may have been something of the sentimental in Maine prohibition years ago, but that introduced into Georgia had been dictated by plain common sense. They had not yet got it in Utah, but they were going to this "fall". The reason they seemed not to want prohibition in this country was because of their sympathy with the moderate drinker, who appeared to be one who could stop drinking if he wanted to, but who never wanted to.

THE REV. E. C. CARTER, Vicar of St. Jude's, Whitechapel, suggested that public houses should be classed in order of moral effect, ranging from respectable and law-abiding inns to taverns which fostered the "white slave" traffic, encouraged betting and gambling, or harboured criminals. In this way it would be possible to distinguish those which were doing a legitimate trade, and were therefore entitled to compensation, if their licences were withdrawn. We should also make the most of our excellent police force, and establish a vigilance society in every rural deanery to raise the moral atmosphere of the district.

The REV. E. A. OSBORNE, Archdeacon of Charlotte, North Carolina, U.S.A., said that there was an ever-growing feeling in favour of local option and prohibition in North Carolina; and that the improvement in all that went to make good and prosperous citizens had been so obvious that recently the manufacture and sale of ardent spirits was abolished from the State, except for medicinal or sacramental purposes. The conditions in America could hardly be compared with those in this country, where a few days ago he had witnessed several things he would never have conceived possible, such as a "female bar-tender" and a drunken white woman.

The REV. ENOCH JONES, Delegate for Cape Town, and for some time Organizing Secretary of the South African Church Temperance Society, said that in South Africa they had closing of public-houses on election days, and a good deal of local option: but there was danger in giving local option without educating public opinion. They were in the thick of a fight on the drink question, constant attempts being made to increase drinking facilities, especially among the natives.

MR. JOHN STUDHOLME, Delegate from the Diocese of Christchurch, New Zealand, expressed the opinion that "No Licence" was still on its trial there. The matter had been brought up again and again in the Synods of the Church, and in no instance had a favourable motion been carried.

The CHAIRMAN reduced his closing remarks to a very few words, as it was already past time. He said he could look back on many years of temperance activity, and he remembered the time when it would have been quite impossible for the Church to have had such a meeting as they had had that morning on a subject which he regarded as the most important of all that could be brought before the Congress. He felt he might sum up the feeling of the whole audience as a conviction that the time had come when power must be given to the people to say what should be done with this drink traffic. They might well take courage and not be afraid of standing in the very forefront of the battle undeterred by threats, and rest assured that the work could not be in vain.

GAMBLING AND SPECULATION

ALBERT HALL. THURSDAY AFTERNOON, JUNE 18

The BISHOP OF MONTREAL presided at the Albert Hall, on Thursday afternoon, over Section A, which had for consideration the subject of "Gambling and Speculation".

The first selected speaker was the BISHOP OF BUNBURY, who said that gambling would never have grown to its present dimensions if we Christians had always done our duty. It was difficult to say anything new ; what we had to do was to organize and carry on a definite campaign. The speaker quoted Ruskin, Kingsley, and Herbert Spencer in condemnation of gambling, but held that definitions were by no means necessary to our present purpose. Broadly, we all knew what was meant, and while the line of demarcation between legitimate speculation and gambling might be hard to trace with exactness, the Christian man with a conscience had no desire to sail as closely to the wind as possible or to say exactly which of the Ten Commandments the gambler broke. Perhaps the greatest difficulty that confronted us in dealing with the evil arose from the fact that so many good people, so many Church-people would shut their eyes to the evil latent in it and stoop to every species of sophistry as they disclaimed such motives as covetousness or any more serious than the desire for recreation. Unfortunately, while intemperance was diminishing, gambling was still growing and spreading. In one way or other, in sport or commerce, it affected all classes, all ages, both sexes, whether in Australia or in England. The bishop, having denounced raffles at church bazaars and threepenny and sixpenny points at the club, and pointed out how the evil was affecting women of all classes, said that the springs of this sin lay in two directions—covetousness and the desire to escape from the sordidness, the dullness, the drudgery of life. Was the Church to see and sit still? If they thought so, they would not be there that day. But there were no short cuts to the end they longed for, the stress of the coming battle must be realized. It was not only with gambling but with the gambling spirit that they had to deal. A strong combination was needed because they had a formidable array of interests against them. Against these they must unite Parliament, the pulpit, the press, and, best of all, the power of the influence of unselfish lives. The electors should bring pressure upon their members, it should be a live question when candidates were seeking for votes. But moral restraint would prove more effective than that which might and could be

secured through Parliament and the law. For the creation of a sound public opinion were needed straighter preaching from both clergy and laity, the support of the Press—to which the bishop made a very strong appeal in the name of the Pan-Anglican Congress—and the pure influence of the earnest women of Christian civilization.

MR. S. H. M. KILLIK, a member of the London Stock Exchange, dealt with "Speculation". He said that, like the Bishop of Bunbury, he found it very difficult to define what speculation was, and equally difficult to give a definition of gambling. It was very difficult to say where legitimate trading ended and speculation began. Business in its simplest form was more or less a matter of speculation. Although he aimed to show that speculation served many useful purposes and could not with advantage to the community be discountenanced, the speaker disclaimed any sympathy whatever with gambling of any form or description. Whilst commercial speculation, even in its wildest form, might be productive of some good, gambling, pure and simple, was valueless and subversive of all those principles which combined to make a man an honourable, a useful, and a desirable member of society. The speaker defended the existence of jobbers on the London Stock Exchange and the bulk of their operations, which involved only as much speculation as other legitimate trading did. It was difficult to see that a person who, to use the common term, speculated in stocks and shares was in any way morally inferior to the ordinary investor. As a matter of fact, the speculator performed a very great service to the community which was frequently overlooked. He increased the number of dealings in the stocks he selected for his speculative operations, and by that means a much better market was established than would otherwise be the case. This enabled investors to deal more freely and at closer quotations. The main thing to be said against speculation was that it had a tendency to develop into gambling. There was no doubt a tendency for persons to speculate beyond their means, and to incur liabilities which there was no reasonable probability of their being able to carry out, and this could only be described as gambling. The Committee of the Stock Exchange did their best to discourage gambling, and the proportion of bargains, which might be considered as gambling transactions, taking place on the Stock Exchange was small when compared with the enormous amount of business transacted there. The principal opportunities for gambling in stocks were provided by so-called brokers, not members of the Stock Exchange, whose business it was to encourage transactions of this description by persons of all classes, irrespective of their position or means. These institutions, by speciously worded circulars, offered inducements to those persons who could ill afford it, to lose comparatively large sums of money by gambling, and it was unfortunate that these

advertisements found their way into some of the most widely read journals in the country. The principles underlying the question of speculation in other markets were more or less on parallel lines with that of Stock Exchange speculation, except that in the case, for instance, of speculating in wheat there were other considerations, involving the well-being of humanity, which did not enter into the question of Stock Exchange speculation. But here, again, it would be a great hardship to farmers in various parts of the world, if they were unable to sell their growing crops for future payment. By this means they were assured of a fair remuneration for their capital and labour, and could better finance their requirements.

MR. JOHN HAWKE, Hon. Sec. of the National Anti-Gambling League, considered "The Press and Gambling". He said that many tributes of gratitude were due to the Press for services which it had rendered to society; but they must not be allowed to blind us to its defects, particularly the most serious of all, the assistance and support it had rendered to the betting and gambling habits of the nation, especially in connexion with horse-racing. The continued publication of the betting odds was doing incalculable harm. But in addition to the betting news and quotations, there were the gambling schemes with which various popular journals sought to increase their circulations. Even these were outdone in the advertisements of traders to be found even in the columns of high-class papers, which took no direct part in providing such temptations. Unless some check was put upon the system, the whole Press must ultimately become demoralized. The worst feature of these competitions was that, while fostering the gambling spirit amongst the young, the poor, and the ignorant, they were to be found in publications which would not be under suspicion by the head of a household, or those in authority in any establishment, as were the sporting or betting prints. The only possible method of dealing with the ever-shifting plans of the Press-gambling farmers was now under consideration by a Parliamentary Committee, and was recommended by the Public Prosecutor. It would forbid the offering of these so-called prizes entirely, if derived from contributions of the competitors. There was much consolation in the reflection that the present heads of our Church were cognizant of the mischief wrought by gambling, and that many of the bishops and clergy were beginning to take measures to cope with it. Ought a single pulpit to be silent upon this matter for any reason whatever? The spirit of gambling was the very negation of our religion, neutralized the benefits of education, brought poverty and misery to the household, impaired the efficiency of the workman, was making alarming advances among women and children, had turned many of our manly games into vulgar and often fraudulent money struggles, and had made

appalling inroads in the *personnel* of our Civil Services and also in the Army and Navy, casting as it were a reflection upon Christianity, when we remembered the precautions taken by the Mikado to prevent the employment of the gambler in the public services of Japan. The work of counteraction was urgently needed, and there was as much necessity in our great sister countries as here, for the poison there was quite as virulent; but we, in England, must remember that we were primarily responsible, owing to the shameful example we had set in horse-race gambling for 100 years. The Public Prosecutor and the Chief Commissioner of Police consider that gambling is responsible for almost as much crime as drink. To combat the former, £1,200 per annum is subscribed; for the latter, £383,000. Surely if the Congress had no other result whatever than to cause the Pan-Anglican world to brace its energies to inaugurate and sustain a ceaseless and ever more determined battle against the spirit of gambling, the meeting would not have been held in vain.

The REV. P. N. WAGGETT said the gambler needed our help, and yet he was the sinner from whom the help of Christians was most constantly withheld. We were wondering exactly what commandment he broke when he had managed to combine in one sin a breach of all the ten. If he was to be protected it must be by the unfaltering voice of the Christian believer. What was wrong about gambling was that it was anti-social and anti-human, and either because the other. It was the abandonment of the essential characteristic of all advancing human life. We were called to assert the divinity of purpose, and our rightful share in it, however limited, and this practice struck at the root of the whole system of purpose by which we were called in the providence of God to defeat the forces of evil. What could be more profligate than to surrender to a particular feature of circumstance, and to invest it with power over will? And this criticism was not emptied by reason of the business element to be found in some aspects of gambling, for as a business it existed on the folly and imprudence of others. They might omit all the horrid circumstances surrounding gambling, for it was no mere instance of failure but the very type, norm, and root of all our social failure, which came from a gamble with the lives of the people. Our essential national sin was the refusal to manage by reason and under the impulse of love our national resources. To the speaker the street news-boy shouting out the "winner" was a symbol of the great gamble. He himself was the lost stake in our national game. Mr. Waggett said he hated real gambling in however small a respect, because of its essential characteristic, and deprecated raffles because of the influence of example, especially on the young. He laid down the principle that, if a thing appeared to be gambling, and appeared to be innocent at the same time, they might be sure it was not gambling, for gambling

was never innocent. But what was not gambling to one, because the stake was practically nothing, might be gambling to others, to whom the stake was real ; and they were bound to have regard to their responsibility in example.

GENERAL DISCUSSION

MISS AUGUSTA DEANE, a member of the Section A committee, took up the question of gambling amongst women of the upper classes, the ignoring of which in the preliminary "Pan-Anglican Papers" had been the subject of some criticism. They could be tender to the working women who gambled because of the monotony of their lives and the difficult conditions under which they worked and lived ; but there was no excuse for those women of leisure who indulged in a selfish and luxurious habit of excited feeling. The difficulty was that good women, women whom we looked up to and respected, seemed to see no harm whatever in playing cards and other games for money, and joining in raffles and sweepstakes. It was said that many women spent more than half their days in the winter months playing cards for money. It needed noble women who were leaders in society to rise up and help by example to put a stop to this.

THE REV. CANON GROSER, Beverley, Western Australia, said that gambling was the cause of great suffering. It behoved Christian people to think of the ruin in house and home ; of the innocent sufferers, wife and child, and creditor ; of the vice, the fraud, the punishment, the suicide. It is not right to blame cards any more than chess or dominoes or billiards ; but St. Paul bids us to "judge this rather, that no man put a stumblingblock or an occasion to fall in his brother's way". He had known a Church to raffle sovereigns for Church funds, and he cried shame ; he had even known a very dear brother to boast of playing cards for threepenny bits. He thought it was time that public opinion was aroused, and the clergy and all good people spoke out. There is no need to quibble over the question, "What is gambling?" It is getting money without deserving it, at another's loss, and it is so fascinating that thousands are infatuated and ruined by it.

MR. MACINNES, Carlisle, dwelt on the difficulty of exact definition of either gambling or speculation. It seemed to many that the question must be solved by consideration of the spirit in which these things were entered into, and of the character of those who took part in them. The speaker claimed that there was an essential difference between gambling and speculation in produce, which, unlike the former, did not mean the gain of one at the direct loss of another, and with no benefit whatever to the community.

MR. GEORGE H. JENKINS, Delegate for the Diocese of Grafton and Armidale, New South Wales, mentioned that a splendid

betting and gaming Act had been passed in New South Wales, by means of which most betting had been confined to race-courses, and had been banished from cricket, football, and golf grounds. This legislation had greatly minimized the evils of betting, and protected the community from the temptations of sharpers and rogues in their own homes; but it did not unduly interfere with genuine sport.

MRS. C. FREWEN JENKIN, Mothers' Union, said that during the winter she had read a good deal on the subject, and consulted many people, and she had got into her mind a very clear principle showing why it was wrong to gamble, however small the amount. There were only two legitimate ways in which property could be transferred—benevolence and exchange. But gambling was an unrighteous and unequal bargain, because the gain of the one side involved the loss of the other. It was only social convention that prevented our seeing what a very ungentlemanly business it was.

In closing the discussion, the CHAIRMAN said that whatever differences of opinion there might have been on minor matters, one thing was certain, judging from papers, speeches, and applause, that he was justified in saying that the voice of the meeting was unanimously opposed to gambling. Although it was not their province to pass resolutions, nevertheless they would leave the hall carrying in their hearts a moral resolution to this effect, endorsed by all. And this unanimity was the more remarkable and decisive as it came from different parts of the world. There was not one whose influence in his or her own circle could not be exercised against this evil for God and His Church, and for the benefit of the young in particular. He trusted that thoughts which may have lain dormant had been roused and strengthened, and that all would go forth resolved to speed God's work.

CAPITAL AND LABOUR
SPEECHES AND DISCUSSIONS

CAPITAL

ALBERT HALL. FRIDAY MORNING, JUNE 16

The BISHOP OF COLUMBIA presided over the meeting of Section A at Albert Hall, on Friday morning, when the subject for discussion was "Capital".

The first selected speaker was MR. C. F. G. MASTERMAN, M.P., who said that he had noticed that every speaker at every meeting in this Section had expressed the opinion that the particular subject with which he had to deal was the most important the Congress had to consider. Mr. Masterman had no hesitation in declaring that of his theme, for traced back to their origin all the social problems they had to deal with could be referred to the creation of a new commercial system outside the ethical region of the Christian Church. He was dealing not with capitalists as men but with capital as a system. Every investor of a few pounds entered into this unmoral—not immoral—region in which he was, perhaps unconsciously, but inevitably influenced by his personal interests, and was dragged into a business of which he knew none of the details and might directly or indirectly be engaged in operations of which he would strongly disapprove. Owing to the development of joint-stock companies, personal responsibility had been lost sight of. It was impossible to moralize the new commercial development. The world of business was as much outside the range of the Christian ethic as the battlefield was, and those who were directing this warfare resembled the ancient gods as the Greeks conceived them—remote, passionless, "loving not, hating not, just choosing so." The question before the Church was whether she should allow this unmoral system to stand entirely apart, or whether she should endeavour to permeate it with Christian ethic, or whether she should help to draw certain ethical boundaries, within which it must be content to operate. Was it not possible by the collective action of the whole community to set such boundaries? It had already been done in regard to slavery, and was now possible in regard to a minimum wage, unemployment, and the like. It was no good nagging at the rich, or worrying capital, or laying too much stress on individual responsibility. They were literally wrestling with principalities and powers.

PROFESSOR R. M. BURROWS, University College, Cardiff, and recently appointed Professor of Greek at Manchester University,

discussed the personal responsibilities of the individual Christian as capitalist. To adapt a famous phrase, we were all capitalists now—every member of a Co-operative or Friendly Society, every Trade Unionist, was a capitalist. It was impossible for the depositor to know even where his money was ultimately being employed, through Bank or Insurance Company, still less what were the conditions of labour or sanitation that prevailed in the particular business which it kept going. Somewhere—where we did not know—men and women were living healthy decent lives or squalid despairing lives as a result of the way our money was being spent. Abominations of which we heard all over the world might have to do with us, and we could no longer wash our hands of the blood of the oppressed. Such second-hand investing was inevitable, but it must affect our attitude to industrial legislation, which we could no longer regard as a matter that did not concern us. Capital was international, and newly awakened to our position as capitalists, we must take upon us our international responsibilities. In regard to direct investment, there were some businesses that the sensitive conscience would avoid. To invest money in concerns that notoriously involved the exploitation of the weak, such as the rubber trade in the Congo, would be to go gratuitously into partnership with the power of evil. There were other businesses which were just as notoriously upright, private employers and company directors who pursued a steady policy of justice and generosity to their workpeople. In such concerns it was a delight to invest, and it was sound economics as well as high ethics to seek them out and compete for their shares, and make the world realize that in the eyes of Christians there were no assets like honour and justice. The great majority of businesses came under neither head. We should always inquire and sometimes object, but, above all, we should never allow our social conscience to be blunted by our own investments. When we read, in an annual report, of “paid agitators”, and find that the remark was punctuated with “applause”, we should be on our guard. We should remember that *a priori* the directors are at least as likely to be in the wrong as they are to be in the right. Further, had we realized the condition of districts in which there were no large private employers, but only joint-stock companies, doing nothing to support the church, or chapel, or institute, or infirmary of the neighbourhood? Was it not the duty of every Christian who held shares in concerns remote from where he lived, to subscribe himself a reasonable proportion of his dividends to the needs of that distant land? It might be said that so long as the money is spent on good works somewhere, it did not matter where it was spent. Were there no masses of respectable Christian people who subscribe but little to institutions of national scope, and thought their charitable duty was fulfilled if they relieved glaring distress that occurred in the district in which they lived? But the districts they chose to live in stultified any such theory

of charity. They were either thinly populated country districts, or congested areas of wealth, where the power to give was utterly in excess of the local need ; yet all the time the industrial districts of our own cities find their institutions starved for want of funds, and the lands beyond the seas where British capital is so largely invested—India, Argentina, Africa—send over their never-failing flow of dividends, while no one thinks, no one cares, no one sends back that tithe of Christian charity that is their very certain due.

MR. GEORGE H. V. JENKINS, a Delegate from Grafton and Armidale, Australia, said he could only speak of capital as he knew it—as wealth, whether in the shape of money or property which is used for producing more wealth, and as, no doubt, a great controlling power in the industrial system. It must have an owner, must be administered by human beings, and in its administration must reflect the strength and the good points, or the weaknesses or imperfections, of those that control it. He could not dissociate capital from the capitalist, and therefore must take the line of speaking of the two together. First of all, large capital in good hands was more useful than the same amount divided up among many people, as illustrated by the gifts of Lord Mountstephen, the Wallace Collection, and the Mitchell bequest in Australia. The power of the rich man to do good was enormous. His power to do evil was limited. Capital in good hands was a sun throwing light and warmth on the human race. But unfortunately it was not always in good hands. The vast gap between great poverty and great riches shows that something is radically wrong. Therefore reforms are loudly demanded. All sorts of schemes of redress are everywhere put forward, some wise and just, others of a revolutionary character. The worst cry of all is that capital or property is robbery.

This cry in Australia was met with a positive programme of reform—a reform extending to almost every branch of industry and trade, making it difficult for capital in any branch of industry or trade to do harm to anybody by causing misery in its expenditure. These ideals were gradually being carried out in Australia, but more particularly in New South Wales. Every one was to have a living wage, to be properly housed, to be well educated—the best kind of capital, to have the chance of obtaining land on easy terms, and to be cared for when old.

Examples of Legislation. The Old Age Pension Act now passed for the whole of Australia ; the Closer Settlement Act to provide land ; industrial arbitration to provide a minimum wage in all industries, to stop sweating, to adjust the balance between capital and labour ; a Liquor Act to stop Sunday trading, and a Gambling Act to prevent waste of capital in that way. This legislation has been of benefit to the workers, and has brought labour and capital into closer touch.

What is capital in Australia?—muscle chiefly to begin with. The labourer of to-day becomes the capitalist of to-morrow. The Closer Settlement Act provides for the compulsory resumption of private

lands above the value of £20,000 when public necessity requires it, but not without giving adequate compensation. The best remedy for the cry "Property is robbery" is this making of many landowners. If men are their own freeholders they will fight to the last for their land. If all capital in the shape of land was passed over to the State and private ownership abolished, interest in it would cease, and improvements would no longer be made.

The Profits of Capital. For people to assert, as some do, that the holder of capital was in most cases able to obtain a larger share of the products than he was entitled to, and the worker a smaller share, was an exaggeration and untrue so far as Australia was concerned. Take, for example, the mining industry. Huge amounts of capital were spent in opening out gold and silver and copper and tin mines. There was in most cases absolutely no return for the capital supplied, the whole of the money going in machinery and labour; and the labour lasted only (unless there was some product from the mine) until the capital supplied was exhausted. Coal-mining and the pastoral industry were more satisfactory to capital. Manual labour was one element in the production of wealth, but was not effective without the capital that makes labour possible. This shows that all labour is limited by capital. Legislation is good which restricts the bad use of capital. But the man who by unwise legislation would drive it away would be an enemy to his country.

CANON H. SCOTT HOLLAND began by emphasizing the kaleidoscopic front which political economy presented—always changing and presenting fresh aspects, as surprising to the political economist himself as to the poor ignorant priest. This capital, which had been the very citadel of individualism, had unindividualized itself, had socialized itself more and more year by year. The whole thing was under the control of legislation. This capital, the very fortress of competition, was itself setting limits to competition. The whole world had passed under its hands. The scale on which it worked had broken down individualism. Private individuals had been compelled to combine in companies, and companies again in federations and trusts. By mere necessity of scale capital had delocalized itself, and being delocalized must become dehumanized—a vast abstraction. It had moreover the whole world for its field, and so had become denationalized. Capital was the most versatile, fickle, and sensitive thing in the world. At every turn in the change in capital, they had been compelled to introduce the power of the State. The old-style "Captains of Industry", for which Mr. Mallock argued, were no longer necessary. The centre of the system was now the man with the instinct for gold—not the noblest and best gift in the wide world nor one they need pay too much for. The old industrial magnates had been changed into an army of magnificent managers; and now the State had got to do all that locally and personally the former individually responsible owners did for the

community. Was there not one more move for the State to take? Labour was entirely dependent on capital, and they demanded that Labour should have a voice in its control. The only power by which it had been touched was Trade Unionism, and that only to a modified extent, with a whole world of unrepresented interests outside. What power could face the enormous power of capital unless there were pitted against it the power of the municipality and the State, in the interests of the workers who were the creatures of its good fortune and the wreckage of its bad?

GENERAL DISCUSSION

THE REV. G. H. AITKEN, Rector of Haslemere, Surrey, introduced the subject of the relief of the poor, in reference to a pamphlet issued in connexion with two years' work of the Winchester Diocesan Committee of which he was the co-secretary. In these vast social problems, the speaker added, one of the tantalizing things was that whatever the Church did, she could only touch one corner with one finger. They, working throughout the parishes of England and the wider world represented at the Congress, were called upon to deal with questions complicated not only by economic but by other considerations. There were two great forces leavening society to-day, the deepening of the social conscience with sympathy craving for direction, and the cry for efficiency. It was for the Church with her network of agencies to bring into co-operation these two agencies.

THE REV. F. LEWIS DONALDSON, Vicar of St. Mark's, Leicester, said they did not want to minimize the value of the beneficent millionaire; but the subject went infinitely beyond the question of charitable relief. He wished that Mr. Jenkins had had one of the labour leaders of Australia to follow him. The arrangements of the day's subject in two separated parts was ominous, for it was as impossible to consider capital and labour apart as to separate Bible and Church; but it was also symbolical of that divorce that existed between the two, and between the worker and the means of production. It was our duty to reconcile the two antagonistic forces. All our resources and the great instruments of production were in the hands not of benevolent individuals but of a great Frankenstein monster, beyond the control of even that which had made it. We wished to save the capitalist himself and to carry the worker forward from political to economic liberty, and this could only be accomplished through the national control of the great means of life.

MR. C. RODEN BUXTON said that legislation alone could provide machinery for the effective control of capital. It was needed too in the interests of the scrupulous capitalist as against the unscrupulous one. In illustration of the power of capital and its wide-spread opportunity for using it against the public benefit, the speaker mentioned the appeals sent out to shareholders to

secure the defeat of the Miners' Eight Hours Bill and the threatened withdrawal of support from Church work over the Licensing Bill, the machinery of good being placed at the mercy of the very power it was trying to curb.

THE REV. C. H. S. MATTHEWS, New South Wales, said it was time some one stood up for the Labour Party in Australia. Time after time it had been abused. He wished they could have had some of its representatives at the Congress; but they could not afford to come, and the Church in Australia was so entirely out of sympathy with labour that she had no labour delegate to send. Mr. Jenkins's ideal was that of Abraham—beautiful, but too primitive and not adaptable to modern conditions. The improved legislation in Australia was the work of the Labour Party, which Mr. Jenkins had abused. (The Chairman here intervened to say that Mr. Jenkins had not done that, and Mr. Matthews entirely withdrew what he had said.)

THE HON. F. S. GRIMWADE, Melbourne, took exception to some of the remarks that had been made about capital. Other things had changed to preserve the balance of power, as, for example, the entry into Parliament of a large and powerful Labour Party. They in the Commonwealth of Australia, which had come in with the century, had gone further; they had had a Labour Government, which might have been in power to this day, if its members had possessed common sense and the courage of their opinions. They only objected to the Labour Party so far as it was identified with the Socialism that would destroy our homes. (Cries of "No! no!" being raised, the Chairman rose and reminded the speaker that that subject would be discussed on Monday; and he again intervened when Mr. Grimwade charged Mr. Masterman with saying that the capitalist was outside Christian influence, the Bishop pointing out that the first speaker had dealt only with capital in the abstract). Mr. Grimwade concluded by reference to the good work the capitalists had done for the Church in Australia, every religious agency in what 125 years ago was a bare desert country having been built up by the capitalist.

THE REV. ALBERT CARSWELL, Minnesota, referred to the financial panic in New York last autumn, resulting from the manipulation of stock by directors for their own benefit. The disclosures led to the stopping of this juggling for private advantage. The difficulty of shareholders lay in their ignorance of what was being done with their money, and he recommended the publicity cure by legislative measures.

THE REV. PREBENDARY HARRIS, Delegate from the Diocese of Hereford, felt Mr. Jenkins had been misunderstood. As one who had lived in Australia for years and had paid a recent visit, he was glad to have his opinion confirmed that the capitalists were not out of sympathy with the Labour Party there. The picture of the benevolent capitalist that had been sneered at was not the true one. It was the whole community working together

for the good of the whole. The speaker praised the work of the Christian Social Union, which he had been the first to introduce into Australia at the Hobart Conference sixteen years ago. In fulfilling the command, "Love one another", they must remember to love with knowledge.

The REV. A. J. WALDRON spoke of the necessity for practising inside the Church the charity which we preached outside, and deprecated suspicion and dislike of a man because of his political opinions.

The CHAIRMAN, in closing the discussion, said that what many had thought would be an intolerably dull meeting had been exactly the opposite. Referring to the question of investment in our colonies, he said he wished that in the earlier days more English capital had been sent out to Western Canada. He trusted that all who had investments in the colonies would make some return by supporting the religious work there. In many parts there was danger of the people sinking into a heathen state. While they hated the sin, they loved the sinner; and he was thankful to notice that not all capitalists were the sinners they were made out to be. The bishop referred in illustration to the good work done by Mr. Cadbury in his model village, and said that in America capitalists were running businesses on similar lines to those of Bournville. In regard to the whole subject, they must rise to a higher platform. Was legislation the last word after all? Was it not rather the setting forward of the power of the risen Lord, of Whom, and through Whom, and to Whom were all things?

LABOUR

ALBERT HALL. FRIDAY AFTERNOON, JUNE 19

The BISHOP OF GLASGOW presided over Section A at the Albert Hall on Friday afternoon (June 19), when the subject of "Labour" was discussed. His lordship said that it was one of the most urgent that had come before the Congress, and that there was one peculiarity in all the problems arising from the consideration of the relations between capital and labour, and it was that, although their interests were identical, yet at any given point they seemed to be opposed. He appealed to brethren from beyond the seas to send up cards without delay, as we were anxious to hear what they had to teach us.

Disclaiming the honour of being able to teach, but bettering the bishop's appreciation by declaring this theme the most important of all, DR. N. W. HOYLES, K.C., the first selected speaker, told of what Canada had been doing to promote the interests of labour. The policy of *laissez faire*, which was at one time strongly advocated by political economists in regard to questions between labour and capital, had to a large extent been discredited in modern days, and it was generally recognized that the State had more to do than "merely to perform the duty of a trustworthy policeman". The two principal Canadian instances were in regard to the "Fair Wages" policy and the Lemieux Act. In pursuance of the former it had been arranged that all Government contracts should stipulate for the prevention of sweating, and whenever a contract was being prepared in any department, a request was sent to the Department of Labour to prepare what was known as a "Fair Wages Schedule" to be embodied in the contract. Two experienced officials attended to this, travelling about, keeping track of local rates of wages, and settling "fair and reasonable rates" for the particular contracts. This schedule was supplied to all contractors before they tendered, and formed a basis of their estimates. This rule applied to all the public works of the Dominion, not only to work undertaken by the Government itself, but also, as far as practicable, to all work aided by grants of public moneys.

As a result of the success of this policy, a provision was now embodied in the General Railway Act, arranging for subsidies only to be granted subject to the condition that the men to be employed should be paid fair and reasonable rates of wages. Thus all railway companies securing any aid from the Govern-

ment by subsidy or otherwise were required to come under this new regulation. This policy had been adopted recently in the Province of Manitoba, and in some other of the provinces of Canada.

The Lemieux Act, as it was generally known, from the name of the Minister of Labour in whose tenure of office it was passed, but really the work of Mr. W. L. Mackenzie King, C.M.G., Deputy-Minister of Labour, was the "Industrial Disputes Investigation Act" of 1907, which provided for the official investigation of all labour disputes, on the application of one of the parties, in the case of all matters affecting any public utility, or of both parties by agreement in other cases, and during the investigation no overt act of hostility must be committed by either side. There had been only one instance of failure to bring about a peaceful settlement.

The labour problems which the Dominion had to solve were in connexion with the influence of American labour organizations on Canadian workmen, and with the unemployed. The Church had done practically nothing in labour difficulties. In the words of a most respected clergyman in Ontario, "The attitude of the Church on this question was not only indifference, but isolation."

MR. T. SUMMERBELL, M.P., as the son of a humble worker, a Socialist, and a member of the Church of England, sought to present to churchmen something of what labour was aiming at, and to bring them to sympathize with it more in the future than they had done in the past. There were things at our door that needed attention. So long as industry was carried on as it was to-day, the unemployed problem would get worse instead of better. Wherever they looked to-day, labour was getting discontented and was formulating and pressing urgent demands. The speaker presented an array of statistics to show how pressing was the claim of the poor and unemployed; as, for instance, that out of the 43,000,000 inhabitants of the British Isles, 20,000,000 were always poor, 12,000,000 were on the verge of starvation, and 1,000,000 were unemployed. The Labour Party had gone to Westminster directly to demand, on behalf of labour, that the unemployed question, the fruit of our present industrial system, should be dealt with at once. The Lord never made the earth for the enjoyment of the privileged few, and the birthright of the worker had been taken away from him. It was time for the people to step in and settle the matter. Labour was not satisfied with its share of the national produce. As a result of the present system, 4,000,000 people were living under overcrowded conditions. Every Christian in the land ought to rise up against the one-room tenement, out of which it was impossible to bring up a strong, healthy, moral race. It was estimated that in 1903 there were 100,000 preventible deaths in England and Wales, and in 1904 of 944,703 children born, no less than 137,490 died within twelve months, pushed out of the world without a chance. There

were 12,000 hungry children in the London schools, and 33,000 wandering children of the slums in the metropolis. One of the most important questions Parliament would have to deal with—and he believed it might be taken in hand this year—was that of the transplanting of labour from our congested town districts to the country, where there were 1,000,000 fewer on the land than there had been sixty years ago, while the soil was going out of cultivation and becoming a barren waste. If that great gathering from all parts of the world could but realize the position and demands of the working classes, and resolve that all should work together to effect reform, the next five years would see a wonderful change, not only in this country, but throughout the world.

CANON REGINALD STEPHEN, Melbourne, said that one of the most striking facts in connexion with the conditions of labour in Australia was the influence exerted by the labouring class upon legislation. The workers were well organized; in every State Parliament there was a far larger proportion of labour members than in any English Parliament; and in the Commonwealth Parliament the Labour Party was perhaps the most powerful of all. Opinions differed as how far this powerful labour influence was for good, but the speaker's own opinion was that there was a nearer approach to social justice in Australia than in any country in the world. Resulting from legislation under the influence of the labouring class, the eight hours' system was firmly established, and had proved an unmixed blessing to all classes; an old age pensions scheme was in operation; sweating had been almost entirely abolished through the prohibition of home work, combined with a stringent Factory Act; and Conciliation and Arbitration Courts or Wages Boards had done much to put an end to industrial disputes. The raising of wages by legislation had a destructive effect in three directions—destroying an industry altogether (an industry which could not afford to pay decent wages was, in the speaker's opinion, a curse to any country), crushing out the inefficient employer (the whole country gaining by his relapse into the position of a wage-earner), and throwing out of employment the old man and the slow worker (a difficulty they had not yet discovered how to deal with). Success of social legislation must depend on the character of the men concerned, and there were some disquieting symptoms—workers repudiating the awards of courts or boards, too little feeling of social responsibility, and a dog-in-the-manger spirit desiring to exclude others from the benefits selfishly enjoyed. These and similar faults were found in all classes and sprang from human nature, and were most dangerous in an advanced system of industrial life. As the working classes attained to power, the more need there was for the Christian Church to impress upon them the virtues of truthfulness and honour, and

self-control and self-sacrifice, without which any society must perish.

SIR GEORGE LIVESEY, head of the South Metropolitan Gas Company, and of the South Suburban Gas Company, said that the acute division or separation of the classes had been one cause of the difficulty between capital and labour. The question was how to unite them. Conciliation, arbitration, trade-unionism, strong organizations on both sides, and State interference occupied attention; but unity and peace, the speaker maintained, could only be secured by co-partnership. By this method the employ es shared in the profits of the business; and if they then invested their bonus in the same business, they became shareholders or partners, and could thus take their part in the responsibility of management. The employer had to make the first move, but it was only a short step. The old personal contact between employer and employed had gone under the joint stock system; but by the adoption of co-partnership a better system than the old had taken its place. Sir George illustrated the working of the system in his own gas concerns, where it had been increasingly successful from the start. In the first year 45 per cent. of the workers saved the whole of the bonus conceded to them (varying in value with the rise or fall in the price of gas), and invested it in the company. Now 90 per cent. did so. Co-partnership had paid employers, and benefited the men themselves, and had given peace. There was only one safe and certain rule for the conduct of all business and other relations of man with his fellows, and in bringing about that lay the mission of the Church of God. It was the golden rule of the Lord Jesus Christ: "All things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them." The work of the Church was to impress the duty of personal responsibility on all, employers and employed alike.

GENERAL DISCUSSION

CANON WALTER WILLIAMS, North Queensland, said that he had left England five years ago, and came back to find everybody mad over Socialism. He begged those who were Socialists to make the tremendous effort of regarding those who were not as nevertheless the friends of labour. The power of labour gave promise of becoming far greater than that of capital, for on the latter some check could be exercised, but what could control labour? Those who were not Socialists had a constructive policy, but it was not "anti" everything individual. The tendency of the day was to do everything for the people; the opposite ideal was to try and find sufficient wages to enable them to provide for themselves. The speaker commended the plan of wages boards and minimum wages.

BISHOP HAMILTON BAYNES said the Congress was to be congratulated that on coming to London its largest hall was required for the discussions on social questions. He laid stress on the fact that drink was not only a cause but an effect of poverty. Sir George Livesey had dwelt on the enormous drink bill of the working classes as a cause of their poverty. He had also mentioned that 90 per cent. of the South Metropolitan gas workers exercised thrift enough to save their share of profits. This seemed to show that they at least were not spending their money in drink, and that when men are lifted above the level of extreme poverty they begin to exercise self-control. It seems then that drink is sometimes the result of poverty and not merely its cause. He went on to deal with the two views of religion—that which regarded it as solely a matter between the individual and his Maker, and that which saw true conversion only in the taking of a man's rightful place in the great membership of the society of God. To those who held the former view the Church was merely an after-thought, to the others the very essence of the thing. We were not only concerned with worship, but with everything relating to the human society. The Church had given a moral tone to the nation by showing her readiness to accept anything to advance the welfare of mankind. They must have a care for the weakest and protect them by legislation, and yet preserve the freedom which was the essential of Christian life.

THE REV. F. LEWIS DONALDSON, Vicar of St. Mark's, Leicester, congratulated Sir George Livesey on coming there with a fighting speech, and acknowledged with gratitude his testimony to the fact that capital and labour were at war. His demi-semi-Socialistic profit-sharing co-partnership was not, however, democratic. By having a business that was a monopoly, Sir George had had an extraordinary advantage in his experiment, but the only safety for the worker lay in the hands of the State. Co-partnership was based on a mercenary doctrine, and in no way appealed to the labouring classes. It did not touch the evils of competition.

THE REV. A. J. I. HUGHES, Founder of the Society for Advocating Government Emigration, contended that the supply of labour was in excess of the demand at the present time, and in the meanwhile the population was increasing at the rate of 300,000 a year. The only remedy was organized emigration, and he advocated legislation for the early training and free settlement of emigrants.

THE BISHOP OF GRANTHAM considered that Sir George Livesey had made the only practical contribution to the day's discussion; not even Canon Scott Holland had put forward anything more than a vague demand, which any one could make, for legislation. He appealed to the audience not to be carried away by specious arguments, to keep their heads, and to defer decisions for further reflection.

MR. M. B. F. MAJOR said that the day's meetings had exhibited a sharp cleavage of opinion. We claimed that the Christian law

must rule social practice. He went on to argue that our money system was based on that of Rome, and was essentially Pagan in conception.

The CHAIRMAN said they had had a most interesting debate. Dr. Hoyle's information about skilled investigation of rates of wages before Canadian Government contracts were let was new to him, and of great importance also was the Dominion's legislation for the compulsory official investigation of labour disputes. The bishop warmly agreed with Mr. Summerbell that the great problem of the day was that of the unemployed, leading some of us to become a little doubtful of the value of our so-called Western civilization, which certainly gave point to the book-title *Civilization: Its Cause and Cure*. Referring to Canon Stephen on wages boards, the Chairman expressed the opinion that it was worthy of serious consideration whether any trade ought to be allowed to continue which did not provide a livelihood for the persons engaged in it. The bishop mentioned several other points in the discussion, particularly referring to Canon Williams's demand for higher wages instead of doles as expressive of a distinct principle; and in conclusion pleaded for people retaining a calm judgement in dealing with social questions. If they thought the man on the other side was a fool, let them at least obey the Scriptural injunction and "suffer fools gladly"; and it might be they might find, as the Scotsman replied to the charge against Edward Irving that he was "cracked", "Ay, ma wee mannie, but ye often see the licht glimmering through the crack."

MONOPOLIES

ALBERT HALL. SATURDAY MORNING, JUNE 20

The ARCHBISHOP OF MELBOURNE presided on Saturday morning at the Albert Hall over Section A, the subject for discussion being "Monopolies". The usual office and hymn were preceded by the reading, by the Rev. J. Carter, one of the Hon. Secretaries of the Section, of Rev. xxi. 1-8. Before calling on the first selected speaker, the Chairman intimated that he had received a telegram from Birmingham to the effect that the bishop had got over his present attack, but that it had been decided he should undergo an operation for appendicitis that (Saturday) morning. The Chairman proposed that the following message should be wired to Dr. Gore: "Sympathy and prayers of all churchpeople, especially those at Section A"—a proposition which was endorsed by the hearty applause of the audience.

MR. JUSTICE HANNINGTON, representing the Diocese of Fredericton, and a Judge of the Supreme Court of New Brunswick, said: The subject was one that the Church should have an opinion on and a policy to formulate. Monopolies might be entirely innocent, such as those given by patent right for a limited time for the encouragement of genius, enterprise, or art; but these are not included in the term as now being discussed. Or they might be immoral and wrong—as, for example, when power is secured by which competition is prevented, production controlled, or prices absolutely fixed of any article or product reasonably necessary for the support of the community; as such, they are prejudicial to the public interests and to the greater interests of Christianity. They were no new thing, dating back to the days of Pharaoh. Time was when trusts were considered sacred and were exercised in the interests of the community, but now we had arrived at a stage when, especially in the United States, elements had been introduced hostile to the welfare of the country and the people. In such cases they were combinations to prevent competition, and by manipulation and power to crush it out and enormously to increase the cost of the article concerned. They were contrary to law as a rule, both in the British Empire and the United States, and the reason they were condemned was they had ceased to obey the command, "Bear ye one another's burdens". The moment this was the case they became contrary to law and morality, for it must be remembered that the Christian religion formed part of the law of England and of the Empire. The speaker dealt with various examples of unrighteous trusts, going in detail

into the operations of the Standard Oil Company. This corporation had swept away the keen competition which had existed in the trade in Canada and the United States by buying up as far as possible all the wells, and by crushing out rival interests where purchase was not possible. J. D. Rockefeller's holding in the Standard Oil Company was now valued at 700,000,000 dollars, and his income therefrom at 35,000,000. That great man and statesman, Roosevelt, had instituted investigation and legislation, by means of which this great combination had been convicted of contravention of the law and fined 35,000,000 dollars; but this was only a year's income to Mr. Rockefeller, and the work of the trust still went on. The speaker had no intention of suggesting that those who were directing such a combine were not good men personally. Mr. Rockefeller was personally a charitable and generous man, but as director of a combine did what could not be morally supported. His company and others were engaged in schemes which were hostile to the general welfare, and ought to be condemned. It had been laid down by the best authorities that when the price of oil or other necessities was reduced to a legitimate amount the whole community was favourably affected in most important directions. He had the highest appreciation for the rich, but he did say that the Church ought so to speak and so to act in such matters that the moral tone of the community might be elevated. Let us go forth as churchmen with this motto: "Do unto others as we would they should do unto us."

MR. GEORGE LANSBURY, member of the Poplar Borough Council and of the Poor Law Commission now sitting, spoke from the point of view of one who believed that the State or the municipality should take over all monopolies. He said it was a mistake to talk as though those who believed in Socialism were on their trial. It was private enterprise which had to justify itself. It was also wrong to speak of the burden of debt which communities were heaping up. Municipal trading was simply social service. As societies grew, the need for associated effort increased, and thus we had come publicly to organize roads, sanitation, water supply, lighting, tramways, education, protection against crime, and protection in case of war, and so on. Why should we not go farther? It was objected that we should crush out individual enterprise, but what about our joint-stock companies that crushed out the small private shopkeeper? The real objection came from the capitalists and their class, who knew that their power to exploit the people would be limited. What was the Church's message to the downtrodden poor in our midst? Most of us were in despair because the multitude would not enter the churches. They did not, not because they did not believe in the Faith, but because they believed we did not believe what we said we believed. We talked of brotherhood and yet

two millions of our brothers and sisters were doomed to unemployment and irregular work. In London 120,000 children went to school hungry. In Dowlais, in South Wales, the housing conditions were worse and more filthy than any that he had ever seen, and yet the works there paid enormous dividends. In Middlesbrough, a town that had grown into being in thirty years, and that had created untold wealth for a few, children died at a greater rate than almost anywhere else. The organization of industry for private gain has been weighed in the balance and found wanting. The poor were poor because they were robbed, and robbed because they were poor. He wanted State and municipal organization of industry to ensure work for all. If this were not the correct way let them find a better, but let them not leave the poor as they were. The challenge to us and to all the Churches was to secure for the poor that "life more abundantly" which Christ came to give.

MR. E. HORACE GREEN, Common Councilman, City of London, denied that municipal monopolies were for the ultimate and permanent benefit of human society. An abnormal amount of municipal trading in a town meant an abnormal amount of borrowing, and the money market always demanded a higher rate of interest and larger discount in these cases. Therefore, the city of London did not believe in municipal trading. One very important objection to municipalities adding to their other work was that their time was already completely absorbed by the duties imposed on them by Parliament. Municipalities also ran the serious risk of being involved in labour disputes, and it would only be human nature for councillors to propitiate by, probably, unwise concessions the men who were at one time their servants, but at election time were their masters—a most undesirable and dangerous dual position. It was enormously important that our public life should be kept free from such risks. We were in these days too much governed by an army of officials, which would get larger and larger if municipal trading went on increasing. The speaker went on to argue that and illustrate how municipal trading had not helped to solve the great question of unemployment; did not and could not help to reduce the price of necessities to the community; had not encouraged the advent of new plans or inventions; had opened the way to bribery, corruption, and jobbery; and had never initiated any new enterprise for the benefit of the community. Let private enterprise be under the control and supervision of the municipality, so that the latter looked after the interests of the ratepayers, the workers, and the community generally, but let it take no share in the financial risk involved in any big undertaking. The wonderful prosperity of this country had not been built up by municipal trading but by private enterprise, private skill, and private effort. It should be fostered and encouraged in every way, and not stamped out by rate-aided competition.

MR. LANSING LEWIS, a Delegate from the Diocese of Montreal, Canada, congratulated the Church upon having once more got ahead of the State. Press and Parliament had been talking for years about the meeting of an Imperial Council, where representatives from all parts of the empire would discuss matters of national interest and importance. The Church had not waited so long. By means of this Pan-Anglican Congress, men and women had come from the four corners of the globe to discuss Christ's kingdom upon earth. He had been called to answer the question, "Is monopoly Christian?" and he found himself bound to speak up for monopolies. Capital and monopoly had been with us from the beginning of the world, and would be with us to the end, whatever Socialists and Anarchists might say. What was wanted was regulation, not spoliation; effective parliamentary supervision, not invective and robbery. He denied that monopoly *per se* could be designated either Christian or non-Christian. Speaking as a layman and, he firmly believed, in the truest interests of the Church, he denied her right to attack anything which was not morally wrong. The simple question, "Is monopoly Christian?" was, he thought, an unchristian insinuation; and this he said although there was no act in his life to which he looked back with more proper pride than the part he played in connexion with smashing one of Canada's greatest monopolies. When monopolists did wrong in a commercial way the people should deal with them; and when they did wrong both morally and commercially then both the Church and the people should join issue with them. Not all monopolies prospered; they did not control the absolute essentials of life; and no monopoly was free from competition. There was monopoly in the printing of Prayer Books, and there was going to be a very strict monopoly over the production of the New Canadian Hymn Book, the General Synod having decided to make all the money possible out of its sale and to devote the proceeds to Church purposes. Cut-throat competition was just as bad as, and more ruinous than, an unfair monopoly. For monopolies conducted in a manner contrary to the public good, he suggested an expansion of the system of examination, supervision, and direct control by properly appointed commissioners. Where the Church could get in her work was in the influence she could exert over the hearts and consciences of the men who had to do with things. There was an unchristian monopoly of which he trusted the great Church of England would never be guilty. Let her never assume that she had a monopoly of the way to the Saviour's feet, or of determining who should or should not be admitted to His presence.

GENERAL DISCUSSION

DEAN HART, of Denver, a Delegate from the Diocese of Colorado, considered that trusts in America were the outcome of the public school system. He gave particulars of the "Great Four" of Chicago

in remorselessly crushing down all independence or rebellion against their meat monopoly. The raisers of stock were ruined, and in Iowa forty bank presidents or vice-presidents had committed suicide in one year through failure to recover money lent to the farmers. He suggested that monopolies should be "tithed", a tenth of their profits being taken over by the State.

MR. H. J. TORR held very strongly that the nation or State was the rightful inheritor of all natural monopolies, but that the best way for developing those was not through the State but by individual initiative. He did not want those who might not agree with Mr. Lansbury's solution to go away and think that the problem must be left untouched. They could stand resolutely for the principle that national resources should belong not to the individual but to the community. The speaker dwelt upon the political danger in municipal trading, and the tendency for such trading to impede progress owing to the long terms of repayment on which it borrowed money. But all systems were good when you had Christian men to work them, and none were good when you had not.

MR. FREDERICK ALDOUS, Southwark, who held that Christianity must permeate our trade to-day, referred specially to the evils of the multiple-shop monopoly, which was ruining the private tradesmen, whose class was a valuable national asset. At present these monopolies were engaged in the effort to cut each other's throats by mad competition, but in the end American combination would come, and then the public would have to pay.

The REV. W. J. D. THOMAS, Washington, said that America had not the monopoly of trusts. He defended combinations of capital as in many ways beneficial, especially the way in which a large and free capital permitted encouragement to scientists and inventors to discover new processes and methods. He considered that labour, as organized in the United States, might interfere with national progress.

The ARCHDEACON OF HALIFAX, Nova Scotia, said that the discussion made it quite clear that monopolies were neither good nor bad in themselves; and in illustration of the good to be derived from them he mentioned the Canadian Pacific Railway and the way it had opened up the vast provinces of the West for the future of the world; and of the bad, the way it was checking the new development by insufficiency of transport. He took it that when monopoly interfered with individual freedom there ought to be some protection for the individual; that when it caused injury to others there ought to be some means of reaching it; and that when it prevented the development of a country a national commission ought to tackle it. It was the Church's duty to see that there was no monopoly in religion, to carry the principles of Christ into every walk of life, to provide good environment, and to teach us all the Mosaic command, "Six days shalt thou labour."

MR. N. F. DAVIDSON, K.C., Toronto, said that they must get at root principles, and that at the root of monopoly was selfishness,

the greed of capital. But there was also a greed of labour which in America also produced monopolies. The Church must get hold of the congregations, and reach alike the business man and the labour man. There must be no one-sided preaching. They justly reprobated the clergyman who refused to preach against the sins of capital because of the fear of contributions dropping off. But equally there should be plain speaking about the personal responsibility of the labour man. It was the things that were wrong in ourselves on which the Church could speak. The whole doctrine of personal responsibility was spreading over America, to a greater extent than, so far as the speaker could judge, it was here.

THE REV. T. HILL, North Somercotes, Lincolnshire, said his purpose was to speak about the chief monopoly of all—that in land. It was the most fundamental of all, and its quantity could not be increased. He urged the separation of land values from improvement values in all assessments, and the concentration of rates and taxes on the former. This would compel land to be put to its full use, would go to the root of the industrial and housing problems, and would relieve agricultural burdens and revive all rural life.

MR. SILAS MCBEE, Editor of the *New York Churchman*, rose specially to protest against Dean Hart's reflections on the public school system of America, which had earned the approval of the Moseley Commission from this country and was regarded by the President, whose children took advantage of it, as one of their greatest democratizing and Christianizing influences. They had one great security against the development of monopoly in the absence of entail. Laws had been passed to check commercial abuses, and the people were behind the President as they had never been behind a President before, showing that America was working together for the good of all.

THE REV. CHARLES F. KITE, Chislehurst, who had been fourteen years in the American Church, pleaded for reform in the land laws. The monopoly of land could not be defended historically; for under the feudal system the land was held of the king for the greatest payment of rent possible, viz. personal service in the field at the call of the State.

THE CHAIRMAN summed up very briefly, for the time of the meeting had gone. He touched on several points in the speeches, illustrating in particular the danger of the influence of municipal labour on municipal voting from the experience of Victoria, where Parliament had had to disfranchise all State servants for a time and give them instead three service members. The Archbishop claimed for Christianity a voice not only in the doctrinal but in the social and ethical spheres. He congratulated the meeting on the calmness and restraint which it had displayed, and on their recognition of the fact that they had not come to hear what they liked but to receive instruction. The whole meaning of the Congress was to give and receive new facts, and their bearing upon the Church's duty.

CHRISTIANITY AND SOCIALISM
SPEECHES AND DISCUSSIONS

CHRISTIANITY AND SOCIALISM

ALBERT HALL. MONDAY MORNING, JUNE 22

The BISHOP OF MASSACHUSETTS presided at the Albert Hall on Monday morning over a very large audience, quite filling the arena and amphitheatre, the subject for the consideration of Section A being "Christianity and Socialism". There was also a crowded platform, amongst those on it being the Archbishops of Canterbury and York.

MR. SILAS MCBEE, Editor of the New York *Churchman*, was the first selected speaker. He said that the part of the subject assigned to him was "What is Christian in Socialism?" and that his answer was, the ethical system of brotherhood. What was permanent in Socialism was the social principle enshrined in it. What was changeable and must change was the so far inadequate expression of that social principle. There had been an increasing power felt wherever the social principle had found expression in any form whatever. The family was at the foundation of our conception of the Godhead and the very centre of the Church's life. Unfortunately, Christianity had forsaken its oneness in Christ, and that was the cause of all the trouble. Confessing one Christ sacrificed for all, and professing to be one Body, His Church, it nevertheless witnessed to-day not to unity but to divisions so wide and deep that nothing but a return to the social ideal of Christianity would restore its rightful unity. Fortunately, in Christendom there were men of power who were demonstrating slowly but steadily that the Church, as it presented itself to the world to-day, did not represent Christ, and all the Churches were learning that the human family would have nothing to do with any organized form of Christianity that did not deal with all social problems. The American Secretary of State, Mr. Root, writing on this subject to him, had pointed out that all great nations passed through a storm-belt of incapacity to unite; and that those which developed beyond this point ruled the world, while those who did not went down; and he called attention to the failure of the Churches to develop this higher power of civilized man to unite. It was strange that where the power was needed and expected, statesmen should find themselves disappointed in the leadership they needed. If, for example, in regard to the drink traffic the Churches did their united part, the State would control, instead of being controlled by the liquor interests. It was passing hard to rise to the dignity of our royal priesthood in Christ and be the brother of our fellow-man. We

were in the world to witness to the oneness of Christ's Body and the absolute oneness of God's family, and any Ministry must fail if it ceased to do so.

Before calling on the next speaker, the REV. A. J. CARLYLE, the CHAIRMAN expressed the regret all felt at the absence of the Bishop of Birmingham, who was to have presided. They were all filled with admiration for his good work, and would be glad to hear that the following telegram had been received : "Bishop's progress most satisfactory." Before passing to his subject, Mr. Carlyle also referred with deep regret to the fact that the bishop, their great and illustrious leader in all these matters, could not be with them. The speaker said he was not there to ask them to become Socialists, for with that company and that platform he felt it would be asking too much, but to try and get Christian people to understand what Socialism meant. Did Jesus Christ reign? Were we doing what we could to make Him Lord and Master? Here was the phenomenon they had to face : Society in Western Europe was nominally Christian, and had been governed for centuries past by Christian principles, and yet, wherever they went, Christian men and women were revolting against the present order and demanding a great and radical change in the name of the sacred rights of humanity and in the sacred name of Christ. Why were they doing this, and what were they asking for? That was a question that Christian people, and especially the great middle class, must consider. They must not expect to continue to govern the world for ever on their present class principles. The wage-earners were everywhere dissatisfied and calling out for equal opportunities of life for all. He denied that the demand for reconstruction was inspired by greediness and covetousness. The charge was wholly false, except in so far that as men and women the workers might have the failings of men and women like ourselves. The movement had far higher motives, and was only one form of the great revival that had its beginnings far back in the eighteenth century with the Evangelical and Methodist teaching that all men were equal before God. The demand was for the prerogatives, the equalities of human life. Was it too great, unlawful, or improper? What did they see in the world as it was ordered to-day? A very few rich, a small number moderately well-to-do, the great majority with little more than necessities gained by unremitting toil and with neither means nor leisure for the enjoyment of the larger life ; a multitude barely above the level of actual want, and beyond that another great multitude who never had enough, although their women and children were driven out to work. Did we wonder they demanded some change? Were we not rather prepared to demand some change for them? These conditions were the result of a blind economic force, and the revolt was against an order with no sufficient moral foundation. Socialism proposed

to transfer the enormous power of capital from individuals to the State. The Socialist maintained that we could not safely leave this power in the hands of individuals who might be ignorant, stupid, capricious, or even recklessly selfish, and were themselves the helpless instruments of the blind force of the engine of competition. The Socialist aim was to be reached by extending and developing the economic process which was actually taking place under their eyes. The middle classes should make a serious effort to get outside of their class standpoint. That poverty was a necessity was an exploded economic theory. Poverty was not a necessity but a disease, and they demanded a cure. If we rejected the Socialist remedy we must find another, for without equality and justice civilization would crumble to pieces and fall in ruin.

MR. W. TEMPLE was the next speaker. In introducing him as the son of the late Archbishop of Canterbury, the Chairman remarked that through his youth the archbishop had stood to him as in the van of thought and moral courage in the Church of England, and that, as he came to know him later, admiration turned to affection, and Dr. Temple stood to him as the embodiment of Russell Lowell's words :—

He best loves truth who to himself is true,
And what he dares to dream of, dares to do.

Mr. Temple was the son of the archbishop, not only in blood, but in character and thought and moral courage.

The speaker, who is a Fellow of Queen's College, Oxford, then addressed the meeting. He said that the subject entrusted to him was that of the relation of our religion to economic questions. He was glad that the Gospel of the Day told the apposite parable of Dives and Lazarus. Some contended that the Church had nothing to do with such questions ; but if we went back to the authority of Christ's example we saw that a great part of the blessings the Master conferred related to the material and physical needs of men. Christ's kingdom included every department of human activity, and therefore we were compelled to deal with economic questions. It was mere muddle-headedness to talk about confusing economics with ethics. One great economic problem was how to secure from a man the greatest output ; but that involved considerations of human personality, and economics could never give practical advice without making assumptions that fell within the region of the Christian religion. The question was, what were the motives on which we could count? To apply Christianity to every department of life it was necessary not only that we should deal with individuals but also that the Christian principle should be manifested in the social system itself, or we should have failed to apply the Christian solution. The present system was the slow product of human choice, and human choice could alter it. Christianity could not endure a system based on

unlimited competition, for competition was selfishness. But it was said that we could not get the best out of a man unless we appealed to the man's self-interest. If that was true then Christ was wrong, and based His religion on a fundamental misconception of human nature. We must insist that competition could only be allowed by Christianity within the limits set by the principle of co-operation. The control of life by the individual possessor of capital must be modified. The speaker did not think that the ideal could be achieved short of nationalization, but that need not concern us now. The Christian was called to assent to great steps in the direction of Collectivism. Socialism as an ideal might be remote, but as a method it was already with us, and it was for us to choose whether we should help or hinder it. The Church had something to gain by this in its special province of men's spiritual welfare. Complaint was heard of the decline in the sense of sin. The reason was that the people who were committing the sins the Church spent her time in denouncing were out of hearing of her message, while circumstances had largely preserved her own members from the grosser faults. Let her concentrate her attention on social responsibility and the sense of sin would return. This progressive social movement might easily fall into dangerous error, and if the new social fabric was to be successfully built, it must be built out of the imperishable materials of Christ's religion, with Christ Himself for its chief corner-stone.

MAJOR W. F. EVERETT, Delegate for the Diocese of Grafton and Armidale, New South Wales, said : It was hard for a man who had lived twenty-five years in the Australian bush to address such a large audience. His subject was the working of Socialism in Australia. He had no hesitation in saying that what was called socialistic legislation had been for the good of that country, and he was sure that sooner or later they would have something of the same sort here. Socialism in Australia was founded on Christianity. If the leading Socialists were asked their aims, they would reply, "the nationalization of all industries". If this involved the crushing out of all individual effort it was not a sound policy. But whatever made the different classes understand one another better was good, and this Socialism had done in Australia. Christianity was the only true foundation of any worthy national movement, and he was sure that this legislation, which was largely the work of the Labour Party, had been guided by God. One great advantage they had in Australia in being all workers. In England a large class were not, and if means could be found to get hold of the idlers it would be a great thing for the empire, and develop the true patriotism that thought of the welfare of other members of society. The surest way to make the idle classes understand things better, to bring the different parties in the State closer together, to build up the constitution of the town dweller, and to sharpen the wits of the agricultural

labourer—besides being of great national benefit—is conscription ; or, if you like it better, universal service.

GENERAL DISCUSSION

THE BISHOP OF UTAH spoke for United States Socialism, which, he said, was Marxian rather than Fabian, being permeated by German socialistic thought infinitely more than by English, perhaps because they had so many Germans amongst their citizens. They believed that certain great new principles for society had been discovered and must be recognized. Environment had most to do with human life, physical, intellectual, and religious, and the Church must help to get the environment right if she expected to get the man right. They accepted the Marxian analysis of value. Under existing conditions, labour was getting a constantly diminishing amount ; it was therefore mere trifling to urge the duty of thrift. We needed to think fundamentally of human life and not of the capitalist's profits.

MR. E. G. SELWYN, King's College, Cambridge, said : They would do well to distinguish between two very different types of Socialism. What might be called the "intellectual" type was hardly to be found in the ranks of the Labour Party, but was deserving of special consideration because of the sinister influence it was exercising throughout the land. It contended for the identity of ethics and economics, regarded morality as a sphere of State, knew no lord but Demos, and rendered unto Caesar the things that were God's. It was the duty of the Church to offer uncompromising opposition to such Socialism, and stamp it under heel. It was refreshing to turn to that which animated the great bulk of the Labour Party which, in the true spirit of Isaiah, Micah, and Amos, was demanding economic reconstruction. To this party the sympathy and consideration of the Church were due and her aid in grappling with social questions, but it was only by being the adherent of no party that she could succeed in being the friend of all. The speaker concluded by some criticism of our prayers and popular hymns, as explaining in some measure that alienation of working men from the Church of which we were always complaining. They were asked to pray for things they did not want, in words they did not understand.

THE REV. LORD WILLIAM CECIL said he felt almost out of place in speaking as a person with no belief in Socialism, but he thought it right to speak against it in the interests of the poor themselves. Two points had been brought out in the speeches : first, that the essence of Socialism was that society should control the means of production ; secondly, that one would never like to see existing society controlling these things. It was evident that they must have a new society, and if it were sinless and wise then the more power that was entrusted to it the better ; but, failing this, there was utmost danger in conferring more powers. The

speaker illustrated the evil effects of State control at home and abroad, especially in the German army, and said they had had no suggestion of any method for getting rid of bureaucracy, which seemed a necessary adjunct of State control. He was not a defender of Capitalism, the capitalists were quite strong enough to look after themselves; but he pleaded that they should not help to put the poor man's neck under the iron heel of Government. It was not the nature of Government but that of the man in the Government which mattered, call him what we liked. We must go for the man, and before giving him more power make him a better and deeper Christian. Without this the selfish man would soon control the new organized power. Selfishness was his trade, and we Christians could never beat him at his trade.

MR. JOHN MALCOLM LUDLOW, a friend of Maurice and Kingsley, and one of the last survivors of the Christian Socialists of 1848, rose to protest against any narrowing of the large word Socialism, which stood for the faith that brought men together in one common force—the faith of Frederick Maurice. In those early days they could never have hoped to see such an audience as that gathered for such a purpose. He believed that the true Christian Socialism was the faith of all present.

MR. W. C. ALLEN, Trinity Mission, Stratford, spoke as a member of the working classes, of the Independent Labour Party, of the Guild of St. Matthew, and of the Church of England. He repeated that what Socialism required was the complete State control of the means of production. They wanted to get rid of the poor. In Bernard Shaw's words, they "hated the poor", hated the state of society that was responsible for their existence, hated the flaunting luxury on the one hand and the abject misery on the other, hated the patronizing of the poor. The cure for bureaucracy was not aristocracy but democracy. They could not denounce Socialism as mere materialism, for, if so, then Christ was the greatest materialist of all. To believe in the Fatherhood of God was to believe in the Brotherhood of Man, and this ideal should be reflected by our individual lives and social system. Socialism would come, and whether easily or not depended on the attitude of the people represented there. Theirs would be the responsibility for putting class against class and man against man. Socialism was attracting all that enthusiasm which ought to be inside, not outside, the Church.

The REV. F. L. DONALDSON, Vicar of St. Mark's, Leicester, could not blame Lord William Cecil for his clever speech, for it made a good foil to the splendid Socialism of the Congress. The fallacy in his speech was that we must not give greater force to Government. We could not, for the State must be supreme then or now. It was not a question of giving greater power, but of redressing the balance of power and spreading the power over a larger number of citizens. Instead of asking what was Christian

in Socialism, they would soon be asking what in Socialism was not Christian. Christianity was the religion of which Socialism was the practice. This great movement sprang out of the awful problem of poverty, the breaking of men's hearts in the mere struggle for existence, and its appeal was for justice, liberty, and life in the deepest sense.

THE ARCHDEACON OF LEWISHAM urged that there was no reason why Christianity and Socialism should not be related; yet they were constantly thought to be opposed both by Christians and Socialists. We have no right to say that the Christian faith implied Socialism; he refused to associate the pure spirit of the life of Christ exclusively with (1) any form of creed, or (2) any Church organization, or (3) any political or economic system. He was himself a convinced Socialist on economic grounds. He was afraid of Socialism without the Christian faith, but he was still more afraid of any other form of society organized apart from God. It is urged against Socialism that it would strike at liberty and initiative in the individual, would abolish the family, and would destroy charity. But economic liberty was the necessary correlative of political liberty. The family was a school in which character was formed and the social spirit created; under present conditions the larger proportion of families had no possible opportunity of realizing anything like ideal family life. It was absurd to quote from some fantastic essay on free love and pretend that that would be the product of Socialism. As for charity or love, it must always remain the bed rock of socialized life. No mechanical organization could ever take the place of human love, raised to the Nth. by Christ. Further, just as to-day we drive Socialistic palliatives into our present form of society, so it is absurd to postulate a cast-iron system of Socialism; room must always be left for individual effort and originality. History taught us that while we strive for the development of society along the lines of our own convictions, its future will be something quite different from that which we attempt to forecast in detail.

DR. A. T. GORDON BEVERIDGE, Aberdeen, contended that poverty was necessary if the present system of industry were continued, for, as Mr. Charles Booth argued, they must have a margin of unemployed to preserve the equilibrium of the labour market. They wanted to establish a system of industry in which it would be easier to act on a system of morality. The taunt that it would need angels to work it could be answered with the retort that even angels could not work the present system. Socialism was not a religion, but had important bearings on religion.

In closing the discussion, the CHAIRMAN said the subject had been discussed largely by clergymen and academics. He wished there had been more voices from directors of great organizations in which stocks and shares were held by middle and working class people. These might have given some information to temper our fine idealism. Did we realize the great change that

had come over us in the last half-century, and the speed at which we moved? Democracy was not 100 years old in practical working. Our safety lay in democracy—a democracy that would enable the people to make themselves felt practically. We had passed from the days when the Church and the upper grades of society believed that the poor could merely be pitied, and most, even the great body of capitalists agreed in this, that all people of all classes should be able to feel that they were living under a reign of justice. The Church had her duty, not in association with any particular group, or party, or standard, but by the development of spiritual force through the cultivation of finer character, fuller intelligence, deeper wisdom, and the sense of brotherhood moving through the society. Let her now so act that in the years to come it might be said she had done her part in promoting the unity of society for the welfare of the whole people.

WHAT IS NOW PRACTICABLE IN SOCIALISM

ALBERT HALL. MONDAY AFTERNOON, JUNE 22

The BISHOP OF COLUMBIA presided at the concluding meeting of Section A, when the subject for discussion was "What is now practicable in Socialism". There was a larger audience than at any previous meeting of this section, many of the private boxes being occupied for the first time. The Archbishop of Sydney and the Bishop of Hereford were amongst those present on the crowded platform. Before the first speaker was called upon, the Rev. Dr. T. C. Fry, one of the Hon. Secretaries, was given the opportunity of explaining that he and his fellow Secretary, the Rev. J. Carter, had done all in their power for months past to secure both sides being adequately represented at these meetings on Socialism, but that they had found the advocates of Socialism far more earnest and far more eager to take part.

PROFESSOR W. J. ASHLEY described the present position of social legislation. In his judgement the dispassionate observer ought by this time to have reached an attitude of entire impartiality as between the two great principles of Individualism and Socialism. The history of the past, and the evident facts of human nature, should have made him realize that individual freedom and social control, individual operation and social action, were alike necessary and permanent elements in human affairs. Having escaped from the bondage of *laissez faire*, we should not be in a hurry to succumb to the other extreme of intellectual superstition. For some time to come progress would have to take a socializing direction, but this anticipation did not imply the acceptance of complete Socialism as even the most distant ideal or possibility. It did not dispense us, moreover, from dealing with every proposal on its merits. The speaker dealt with the United Kingdom only, considering that different conditions in Australia and America might prevent what was practicable here from being practicable there, and vice versa. To many and grave tasks the State in England had recently been committed. Most of the great services which were necessarily of a local and monopolistic character had been taken over by the municipalities, and the local authorities had been further charged with the duty of providing primary education. To these comparatively familiar duties were now to be added town-planning; for the first time the hours of labour of adult men were going to be limited by

express legislation in the Miners' Eight Hours Bill ; and public pensions for all the aged poor were to be provided. We must be cautious in further proposals, for there was danger lest legislation should outrun the capacity of administration. The bulk of new social work would certainly be left, in one way or another, to the local authorities ; and the fundamental question was how large was going to be the supply of able, disinterested, and zealous members of councils ? It was dangerously easy to think that legislation would execute itself. For example, there was on the statute book a valuable housing Act of which very few municipalities had made any energetic and persistent attempt to take advantage. The speaker went on closely and critically to examine the two new and enormous undertakings which were being urged upon the State--the provision of work for the unemployed, and the regulation of wages. In regard to the first problem, he thought our main hope must rest in the limitation of internal competition among employers, by the growth of capitalistic combination. Labour colonies would only lessen the obstacles to more ruthless competition, the root of all evil ; but properly grouped and co-ordinated labour exchanges might mitigate unemployment. For the regulation of wages, they might regard universal compulsory arbitration as quite out of the question for us, owing to the attitude of the great trade unions ; and the experience of Victoria seemed to show that even a more limited measure establishing wages boards for "sweated trade" would break down in this country. A minimum wage might indeed safely be prescribed in connexion with Government contracts. The most pressing need, however, of the present time was the modernization and adequate equipment of the machinery of control.

CANON A. W. JEPHSON offered a few ideas from a practical administrator. He was not a Socialist, believing the economics of Socialism were unsound and its morality questionable, although recognizing the excellence of the work the Socialists were doing for their fellow-citizens and admitting that a large portion of their programme could be adopted. The Socialist when he dealt with human beings was generally right, but wrong when he got on to the subject of property, which he did not know much about. If greed and luxury increased, regardless of the effect on those who provided the means for their indulgence, society must be prepared to control not only monopolies but industries. There could be no free bargaining when one of the parties was hungry and likely to be hungry. There were some proposals which the speaker cordially commended--the feeding of underfed school children, the safeguarding and support of childbearing women, the limitation of child labour, extended education, and old age pensions. There was need, too, for the passing of a measure for the introduction of wages boards as in New Zealand and Australia ; and he suggested that an attempt in this direction should first be

made in regard to one sweated industry to see how the system would work, because the conditions here were different from those obtaining in Australasia and considerable modification might be needed. The awful sin of allowing men and women to work for starvation wages rested on us, and we should look more closely to see whether by our purchases we were personally contributing to this ghastly state of affairs. The State would deal with monopolies in the interests of the people at large. Even in America, the home of Individualism, the collective control of monopolies was making its way, as in the taking over of the Chicago trams. The temptation of making money out of human lives must be stopped. The liquor question was being dealt with, and that of the land must be too, and the nationalization of the railways would have to be considered.

Canon Jephson had not concluded his speech when his time had run out, and the Chairman remarked that if he had gone on he would have shown us more and more that he was a Socialist after all.

SENATOR HENRY DOBSON, Australia, said that the gratifying attendances at the Albert Hall showed that churchmen regarded Section A as the most important, and felt that future development depended upon concentration on these social questions. He spoke from the point of view of an Australian politician, who, owing to the curse of party politics, found himself in opposition to a strong labour party; and he did not like the position, for, although not a believer in Marxian Socialism, he strongly believed in Christian Socialism, or applied Christianity, and wanted to see it pushed ahead. He thought that what they wanted, as churchmen, to get hold of was what was practicable for the Church in Socialism. Ignoring the extremists, they should sympathetically watch the movement and pick out all that was best in it, and help it forward. It was necessary to go slowly, steadily, and experimentally to work; for the Church would have to learn its work just as the individual had had to. He believed that every item in Christian Socialism was practicable, but every kind of reform must proceed by the natural law of evolution. As a bishop had well said: "We must go slowly; but for goodness' sake let us go." Politics had got to be more religious or we should do little good. The Church would have to have amongst its members men devoting themselves to the study of economic laws, for an economic revolution would have to precede a spiritual one. He suggested that a Church Council of advice should be formed, comprised of Politicians, Economists, Socialists, and anti-Socialists, to watch legislation and see that the Church took its proper share in influencing it and moulding it. The speaker dealt with various items in the socialistic legislation in Australia, only condemning one thing, the old age pensions scheme, which he contrasted very unfavourably with that of Germany.

THE REV. J. G. SIMPSON, Principal of the Leeds Clergy School, said that he was not a member of the Christian Social Union, still less an adherent of the Church Socialist Union, but he came from the heart of the Pudsey Division, and he wanted to bring home the true lesson of Pudsey to the Church and people of England. The Socialists went to the poll in a solid phalanx of 1,200, every expected vote being polled. All over the North of England we were face to face with this rising tide of Socialism which, even if we would, we were powerless permanently to resist. Why did he think so? Because any one who would take the trouble to study, without prejudice and at first hand, the new spirit which had arisen among the hand-workers of the country, could not fail to be convinced that the ideals which were gripping the popular imagination were held like a religion and loved like a bride. Why would men go on believing that the Socialist was an insincere agitator who in the interests of anarchy appealed to the passions, the envy, the cupidity of the working class? If they had ever attended a Socialist meeting in the North of England they would know that it was animated by a spirit of belief in humanity, by a divine optimism, by an enthusiasm for the common weal, like that which pervaded that Congress. It was the wisdom of the practical man not to damp but to direct the enthusiasm which sprang from the old men who dreamed dreams and the young men who saw visions. There were several things that were not only practicable but urgently practicable in the course which the Church must follow in regard to Socialism: (1) we must allow it a free field just as to Liberalism and Conservatism; (2) we must consent to understand what Socialism really was, to study it as presented by those who spoke for it and not as misrepresented by its opponents; (3) we must not discount it as Utopian, for so was the kingdom of God; (4) and, if it was the function of the Church to declare general principles, it was our duty to preach the right general principles, not pious platitudes, but the sacred principles of brotherhood and service.

GENERAL DISCUSSION

MISS MARY PHILLIPS said that when she heard arguments between extreme Socialists and Christian anti-Socialists it always reminded her of the well-known saying of one of George Eliot's characters who, when listening to a heated debate, said to the combatants: "You say this—and you say that—but the truth will rise between you." The Church has now come on her journey through life to a signpost headed "Social Reform". How long is she going to hesitate as to whether she will take that path or not? Remember what happened when a signpost inscribed "Science" pointed the way. We shall never know how many of her children the Church lost during that halt. "What is now

practicable in Socialism?" is asked. What is now practicable in Christianity? I ask. Does the Church as a whole think to slip into a bypath while this question is being answered, or does she intend to help to answer it? It cannot be answered in as Christ-like a way without her as with her. Dare she shirk her responsibility?

THE REV. H. S. WOOLCOMBE, Head of the Oxford House, Bethnal Green, said that the working classes must be brought into the Church in order to help the Church to realize its duty. The Church ought to have its labour members as well as Parliament. The truest charity to-day did not consist in ambulance work, but in fencing work—not merely in helping the injured, but in keeping the whole community from injury.

DEACONESS ELINOR, Woolwich, denounced the attitude of many church-people towards individual Socialists even when they belonged to the Church. Might it not be possible to treat Socialists as at least possibly brethren? Could not also communicants band themselves together to help to carry into effect the large amount of socialistic legislation which we already had, and do something to remedy the paralysing shortage of inspectors?

THE REV. BARTON R. V. MILLS, Assistant-Chaplain of the Savoy, took exception to the suggestion made by several speakers of the nationalization of industries as a remedy for unemployment. He thought that the State should give every boy on leaving school the means of learning a trade, and require him to do so. At present 50 per cent. of such boys take up occupations which lead to nothing and terminate with boyhood. He would like to see every one, whether "duke's son or cook's son", compelled to qualify for a trade or profession. We should then hear less about the "idle rich" and "unemployed poor". The duty of the Church was not to inveigh against class distinctions, but to breathe into all classes the spirit of Christian brotherhood. This was St. Paul's method, and a much better one than the raging Socialism with which the hall had rung that morning.

MR. N. F. DAVIDSON, K.C., Toronto, said that in Canada they already had much legislation of a socialistic character; and the question for churchmen was how they were going to deal with this growing tendency by providing Christian guidance and control. They must not repeat the error of the American Church at the time of the Revolution, when she refused to accept accomplished facts, or that of the Canadian Church, eighty years ago, when she refused to recognize lay help. We had got to get uncomfortable about personal responsibility. He would like to see the individual life made to sing with the joy of responsibility and service.

In closing the discussion the CHAIRMAN said that they ought to be thankful beyond words for the work that had been done by Section A. At this, their last meeting, they ought to express their warm thanks for the splendid work that had been done by

the two Hon. Secretaries. With all the tremendous questions they had had before them, let them not be content with the wretchedly low idea of setting against each other the extravagances of either side, and coming to the impotent conclusion that practically no good could come from these meetings. Let them rather be resolved to go back to work, to lift up the highest standard they possibly could for the people and themselves. Let their last thought be that while all that could be done by collective action should be done, it was by themselves being wholly and truly consecrated to God's service that the end would be won.

"It takes a soul to move a body : it takes a high-souled man to move the masses to a cleaner sty : it takes the ideal to blow an inch inside the dust of the actual."

INDEX OF AUTHORS

Author.	Part I.	Part II.	Author.	Part I.	Part II.
	Speeches and Discussions. Page.	Pan-Anglican Papers. No.		Speeches and Discussions. Page.	Pan-Anglican Papers. No.
Aitken, Rev. G. H.	82		Elinor, Deaconess	110	
Albany, Bishop of	31	1 ^b	Ely, Ven. Archdeacon of		4 ^e
Aldous, Frederick	95		Everett, Major W. F. ...	101	
Allen, W. C.	103		Eyre, Douglas	16	6 ^d
Anonymous.....		3 ^h	Farquhar, Rev. Canon ...	43	
Anson, Rev. Harold	66		Gardner, Rev. D. Charles	34	
Ashley, Prof. W. J.	106		Gibraltar, Bishop of	22	
Askwith, G. R.	49		Glasgow, Bishop of	90	
Barnett, Mrs. Samuel.....	57		Grantham, Bishop of.....	89	
Baynes, Bishop Hamilton	89		Green, E. Horace	93	
Beveridge, Dr. A. T.			Grimwade, Hon. F. S. ...	54, 83	
Gordon	104		Groser, Rev. Canon	75	
Birmingham, Bishop of ...		6 ^a	Halifax, Ven. Archdeacon		
Brandreth, Miss	69		of	95	
Bray, R. A.....		3 ^f	Hannington, Justice	91	
Brown, Rev. Canon	34		Harris, Rev. Dr.....	34, 69, 83	
Bull, Rev. Paul B.....		3 ^a	Hart, Very Rev. Dean ...	94	
Bunbury, Bishop of	71		Hawke, John	73	
Burrows, Prof. R. M.....	78		Hill, Rev. H. Erskine ...		6 ^b
Buxton, Charles Roden...	82	4 ^a	Hill, Luke M.	60	
Canterbury, Archbishop of	2		Hill, Rev. T.	96	
Carlyle, Rev. A. J.	99	4 ^f , 5 ^b	Holland, Rev. Canon H.		
Carswell, Rev. Albert ...	83		Scott	11, 81	4 ^b
Carter, Rev. E. C.....	35, 69		Hough, Rev. W. W.		4 ^e
Cecil, Rev. Lord William	102		Hoyles, Dr. N. W.....	85	
Chadwick, Rev. W. E. ...	52		Hughes, Rev. A. J. I. ...	89	
Cochrane, Miss Constance	60	3 ^k	Imai, Rev. J. T.....	39	
Columbia, Bishop of	15, 35, 70, 84, 110		Ipswich, Bishop of.....	20	
Conybeare, Rev. W. J....	68		Jenkin, Mrs. C. Frewen...	76	
Creighton, Rev. O.....	61		Jenkins, George H. V. ...	76, 80	
Croydon, Bishop of	68		Jephson, Rev. Canon		
Davidson, N. F.....	95, 110		A. W.	107	
Davis, Rev. E.		1 ^e	Jones, Rev. Enoch	70	
Deane, Miss Augusta.....	75	3 ^h	Kensington, Bishop of ...	65	
Dearmer, Rev. Percy.....		3 ^d	Killik, S. H. M.....	72	
Deobson, Senator Henry... 54, 108			Kite, Rev. Charles F. ...	96	
Donaldson, Rev. F. L. ... 82, 89, 103		4 ^d	Lansbury, George	92	
Dove, Rev. J. Ll.	51				
Draper, W. H.		5 ^a			

INDEX OF AUTHORS

Author.	Part I.	Part II.	Author.	Part I.	Part II.
	Speeches and Dis- cussions. Page.	Pan- Anglican Papers. No.		Speeches and Dis- cussions. Page.	Pan- Anglican Papers. No.
Lees-Smith, H. B.		4 ^c	Rashleigh, Rev. A. S.	55	
Lewis, Lansing	94		Robertson, Rev. J. A. ...	69	
Lewisham, Ven. Arch- deacon of	55, 104		Rogers, Rev. Clement ...		6 ^c
Livesey, Sir George	88		Russell, Right Hon. George W. E.	32	
Longley, Rev. A. L.	55		Ryerson, Rev. Egerton ...	43	
Ludlow, John Malcolm ...	103				
Lytton, Earl of	63		St. John's, Kaffraria, Bishop of		1 ^c
McBee, Silas	96, 98		Sampson, Rev. Canon ...	61	
McDonald, Judge Herbert S.	64		Selwyn, E. G.	102	
MacInnes, D.	75		Shadwell, Dr. Arthur, ...	59	
Major, Mark B. F.	54, 89		Shebbeare, Rev. C. J.	33	
Massachusetts, Bishop of	5, 104		Simpson, Rev. J. G.	109	6 ^e
Masterman, Charles F. G., M.P.	78		Smith, Miss Constance ...	46	
Matthews, Rev. C. H. S. ...	83		South Tokyo, Bishop of		1 ^d
Melbourne, Archbp. of ...	43, 96		Stephen, Rev. Canon R. ...	87	
Mills, Rev. Barton R. V. ...	68, 110		Studholme, John	70	
Moore, Rev. Canon C. ...	36		Summerbell, T., M.P. ...	86	
Montreal, Bishop of	10, 36, 76				
Moule, Ven. Archdeacon	38		Temple, W.	100	
Newcastle, N.S.W., Bishop of	24		Thomas, Rev. W. J. D. ...	68, 95	
New Guinea, Bishop of ...	37		Thompson, Alderman W. ...	58	3
New Hampshire, Coadju- tor-Bishop of	56, 61		Torr, H. J.	95	3 ^c
North Queensland, Bishop of	17		Troughton, Miss	55	
Osborne, Rev. E. A.	70		Tucker, Rev. Canon N. L. ...	30	
Parker, Captain James ...	35		Tuckwell, Miss G. M. ...	7, 55	3 ^e
Peile, Rev. J. H. F.		1 ^a	Utah, Bishop of	69, 102	
Persse, C. de B.	43		Waggett, Rev. P. N.	74	
Phillips, Miss Mary	109		Waldron, Rev. A. J.	84	
Pinchard, Rev. Arnold ...		6 ^f	Williams, Rev. Canon W. ...	88	
			Wilmer, Rev. C. B.		6 ^g
			Wood, John W.	58	
			Woolcombe, Rev. H. S. ...	110	
			Zululand, Bishop of	42	

PART II

PAPERS PREPARED AND PUBLISHED
FOR THE CONSIDERATION OF THE CONGRESS

PAN-ANGLICAN PAPERS

Being Problems for consideration at the *Pan-Anglican Congress*, 1908.

SANCTITY OF MARRIAGE AS THE BASIS OF HUMAN SOCIETY

(IN CHRISTIAN LANDS)

BY REV. J. H. F. PEILE

THE subject of Christian Marriage, whether we reverence it as a Sacrament, or are content to view it merely as a state of life allowed in the Scriptures, is one which above others needs wary walking. On the one hand it is hedged about by weighty sanctions of Canon and Civil Law, and fenced in with the still more ominous Tapu of immemorial custom. It savours of presumption to discuss as an open question what the wisdom of our forefathers has settled once for all. Moreover it is further obscured for our instinct, if not for our intellect, by the Manichean theories of Asceticism which have never lost their hold on Christian thought. On the other hand it involves at once the largest social problems, and the most intimate personal sentiment;—sentiment which is partly silly and even prurient and safely to be dismissed without consideration; but much more of it also so sacred, that even to speak of it is, in some measure, to encroach upon the inviolable privacy, not of the family only, but of the individual soul.

Therefore to treat such a subject with authority requires a profound and sympathetic knowledge of the social conditions and inner lives of men in other times, classes and countries, as well as our own; to speak of it with sincerity and acceptance demands a habit of mind finely tempered of frankness and delicacy;—and a power of exact and noble expression which is the peculiar heritage of the poet.

It follows then that I must renounce the hope of expressing my meaning in a manner which will cause it to be gladly received by all who hear me. I must be content with sincerity; and for that I ask a hearing, patient, and as sincere as I shall try to make my utterance.

If we are to do any good, we must try to set aside our prejudices, our likes and dislikes, and to recognize loyally what is known of the facts of social and individual life which are concerned with and influenced by marriage; and further we must be scrupulously honest in our efforts to ascertain what is the real and essential teaching of Christianity. That is the condition on which we can hope that our discussion of such a subject as this will issue in wise and fruitful counsels.

I. It appears convenient, in the first place, to formulate, and, if necessary to criticize, the Canon which we intend to apply in our judgement of the facts, and in our practical conclusions. Viewed in

one aspect, the appointed task of Christianity has been to de-orientalize marriage. Let me pause for a moment on the phrase and explain exactly what it is intended to convey.

The Oriental conception of marriage treats woman not as a person at all, but as a chattel, held in absolute ownership by her lord, and valued chiefly for physical qualities. She is perhaps the best of a man's possessions, but ranks with *them* and not with him, as we can see in the text of the Tenth Commandment. Our sensibilities are naturally shocked by a crude statement of this view of the marital relation; but the spirit of it is not without influence to this day on the thought of the Western world. Greek poetry, it is true, offers us a nobler ideal of womanhood, but it is not in marriage that it finds its highest and most characteristic expression. In its consummate achievement, the *Antigone* of Sophocles, a sister's devotion, not the love of a wife, is the mainspring of the tragedy. And without dwelling on those darker aspects of Greek civilization which kept Woman from her rightful place, we may note in passing that the conception of romantic love, between man and woman, which, however fantastic and distorted, still regards Woman as an entity in her own right, first emerges with Meleager of Gadara in the last century before Christ, long after the classic period had closed.

In republican Rome the bride passed from the *manus*, the possession, of her father, into the *manus* of her husband; and, although in later days Roman women enjoyed a full measure of emancipation, it was at the cost of the dissolution of morals and the break-up of family life.

The Teutonic nations had from the first a wiser and juster view of the position of women. But the conditions of society during the long ages of the growth of civilization, gave a preponderating value to the qualities in which men admittedly excel—physical strength, courage, and energy—and the Civil Law, unchallenged by the religious feeling of the time, sanctioned and endorsed the implied comparison. A woman, unless she could vindicate her right by exceptional gifts, was viewed and treated as a pawn in the game of politics and property.

In the present day, while some of us cling to the old fallacy, we are confronted by a different, but, as it seems to me, an equally perilous misconception of the facts. With the advance of civilization, and increased security of life, the mediaeval theory has broken down. The English law of property has at last recognized a woman's right to her own possessions. Women demand, and are winning, full rights to their own labour, and their own intellectual endowments. In a protected and orderly Society they prepare to meet Man on his own ground, and claim, not only equality, but identity of function in the social organization. At the beginning of the twentieth century in England, Man and Woman are in process of becoming, no longer owner and chattel, no longer master and slave, but competitors in the struggle for life.

The true natural relation which it is the business of Christianity to present and maintain is very different. There can be no com-

parison, in the strict sense of the word, between beings not rival but complementary; each possessing qualities which are not found in the other, but are just those which are needed to give effect to the hitherto potential qualities of its correlative. Physically this is a truism. And in the sphere of emotion it is partly recognized; that is, it is admitted in the case of passion; but it is not always fully recognized with regard to that more sober and permanent marital affection, which is a higher power of friendship and comradeship. Before, however, we can arrive at a just conception of Christian marriage, that is, marriage in accordance with the whole law of our nature, this complementary relation must be extended to the whole realm of being, which has not forgotten that it was made in the image of God.

Such a marriage as this will be a free and equal compact, based upon instinctive and reasonable attraction, which is the outer and visible sign of an inner mutual need, and a mutual power of help and completion, valid for all the elements in the being of the chosen partner, body, soul, and spirit; a compact, therefore, which is permanent, not for convenience only, or by the law of man, but in its essence, because it touches things which are not subject to the limitations of place and time.

2. Now if the general enforcement of this ideal of marriage has been the appointed task of Christianity, it must be admitted that Christianity has, owing to various hindrances, advanced so slowly, and achieved so imperfectly, that it is still possible for a hostile critic to say that "Christian doctrine exhibits the same contempt for Women which all Oriental religions manifest", without being instantly refuted by the common sense and experience of mankind. In other words, the Church, the Christian society, has not understood fully, and carried out faithfully our Lord's teaching on this most important of social questions. It follows therefore that we are bound to distinguish sharply between Christ's own teaching and the decrees of any ecclesiastical authority, even the precepts of so early and loyal a follower as St. Paul. The thoughts of St. Paul on this subject are never quite free from the prevailing Oriental ideas of his time; and he is further influenced by an almost Essenian asceticism which leads him in one place¹ to speak of marriage as a sort of permitted concubinage, a mere concession to human frailty: "it is better to marry than to burn." It is comforting to find that in another, and a later Epistle,² he rises to the conception of marriage as a "great mystery"; that is, very much what is meant by a Sacrament in the wider sense of the term. But he never reaches the level of Christ's teaching, and never quite escapes from the notion of a comparison in which Man proves to be the superior.

The essence of Christ's general teaching is to insist on the value of each human soul, as a member of God's family. The result of His teaching on marriage is to raise Woman from the position of a chattel to that of a person, who brings to her union with Man

¹ 1 Cor. vii.

² Eph. v. 32.

a different but equivalent personality, and thereby to exalt marriage from a merely physical union to one that is truly social, and more than social, spiritual and ideal.

This high doctrine, as we are ready to admit, involves monogamy. The store of service and affection which the husband owes is rightly claimed by one, it cannot be divided or scattered. But it involves also the permanence of the obligation of the marriage tie during life. The limitations of time which apply properly to secular contracts can have no relation to the spiritual covenant of marriage. "He answered and said unto them, Have ye not read, that he which made them at the beginning made them male and female? . . . Wherefore they are no more twain, but one flesh. What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder."¹

But in this matter we are not left to inference. In striking contrast with the usual tenour of Our Lord's teaching on social questions, which is general, and deals more with character than with specific acts, His pronouncement on this point is absolute and explicit :

"Whosoever shall put away his wife, and marry another, committeth adultery against her. And if a woman shall put away her husband, and be married to another, she committeth adultery."² Divorce followed by re-marriage is a breach of the Seventh Commandment. I am taking it for granted that the true form of Our Lord's utterance is found in St. Mark and St. Luke³ : the prohibition is absolute, without the single excepted case which is given in the text of Matthew, in words which are now generally rejected by critics ; and whose interpolation may reasonably be accounted for, like the relaxation of the law of Moses, as a concession to the hardness of men's hearts. It is impossible for me here to go into the arguments for and against the genuineness of this much debated clause ; but, to my mind, the question is settled by the protest of the disciples in Matt. xix. 10. "If the case of the man be so with his wife, it is good not to marry," a protest which could never have been extorted from them by an interpretation of the Jewish Law of Marriage with which they were perfectly familiar.⁴ We are bound therefore, I think, as Christians, to accept the prohibition as absolute. Undeniably it sometimes involves hardship for innocent persons ; but in that it does not stand alone in our experience of life ; and, on the other hand, it does not prohibit the separation in external things of husband and wife, when gradual estrangement of sympathies, or the degeneration of one party to the compact, has made continued union a torment to the other, and a danger to the children ; nor does it forbid law and public opinion to extend their protection to the sufferer in an ill-assorted marriage.

3. It is important, however, to remember that, absolute or qualified, the prohibition does not constitute the whole, or the more important side of Our Lord's teaching upon the sanctity and obligation of family

¹ Matt. xix. 4.

² Mark x. 11, 12.

³ Luke xvi. 18.

⁴ On the whole question see the notes on Matt. v. 32 and xix. 9, in Allen's *St. Matthew, International Critical Commentary*.

life. The question of divorce, urgent as it unquestionably is at the present time, may easily be given a prominence which is disproportionate, and actually militates against its sensible and permanent solution. It is no reasonable policy to attack, directly and separately, what is only a symptom of a deep-seated moral disorder, unless we endeavour at the same time to cure, or better still to prevent the malady itself, the false and trivial conception of marriage and family life. It is the office of the Church to impress upon the mind of the human race such a conception of these sacred things, that people will not dare or desire to deal lightly with them. For us as Christians the motive to this reverence will be found abundantly in the teaching of Our Lord. By precept and example He makes family life in the fullest sense a Sacrament; itself, by God's mercy, common to the use of all men,

not too bright and good
for human nature's daily food :

yet, like the Bread and Wine, seen by wiser eyes as a miracle, a miracle of natural growth and fitness for its purpose; and typifying the highest and most lifegiving truth that can be known; even that the Eternal and Omnipotent God is a Father; and we, frail and imperfect creatures, men and women, not His playthings or His slaves, but His children. A sincere and reverent contemplation of the words and life of Christ will guard us from the temptation to disparage either the affections or the discipline of the Home.

All that we know of the youth and early manhood of the incarnate Son of God is contained in a few verses of St. Luke's Gospel. But the reticence of the inspired Evangelist is more significant than the trite fantasies of the uncanonical gospels: for his sparing words, and his silence, alike reveal to us the mystery, that the wisdom, which could already astonish learned age, must still be schooled and trained by the sweet daily ministrations of family intercourse and loving obedience; and that not for nothing did He who was to be the Redeemer of a world, dwell long years pent in the narrow circle of a Galilean village household. And when the time came, and He passed for ever from that humble, well-loved threshold, its memories were still about Him to the end of His earthly life. Even in the mortal agony of the Cross, His thoughts turned to her of whose pangs He was born a man; whose tender love had shielded His weakness, and ministered to His childish wants; to her who, as mothers must, had felt the sword pierce through her own heart also, as she watched Him grow beyond her shielding care, beyond her power of help and understanding.

Everywhere too, His teaching repeats and emphasizes the lesson of His life; not only in the great passages upon the Fatherhood of God; but also in the choice of a little child as a pattern to all who would enter upon the first stages of the Christian life; in the picture of the prodigal remembering his father's house, and returning thither, not to be repulsed; in the illuminating words which remind us that it is not pattern parents only who can do more for their children

than a stranger can—"If ye then being evil know how to give good gifts unto your children." And finally, even in that stern warning, sometimes perversely misinterpreted; "He that loveth father or mother more than Me is not worthy of Me, and he that loveth son or daughter more than Me is not worthy of Me;" He speaks of the ties of blood and marriage, not as things to be lightly cast away, but as ranking with the very life itself, and yet to be sacrificed, if need be, for Christ's sake; and always to be valued in Him and for Him.

4. Now it is most important that we should realize clearly that this sanctity of marriage and home life, which seems perhaps to us self-evident, is being undermined, and that from several directions.

The libertine demand for freedom from restraint in sexual matters need not delay us long, though indeed it constitutes an appalling menace to the well-being of Society; for it is widely accepted in practice, it is supported or tolerated by a considerable mass of lay opinion in many countries, and actually receives a sort of public sanction from the amazing confusion and laxity of the divorce laws in some of the States of America. But it cannot be met by argument, but by giving to Christian opinion the moral authority of consistent and holy lives. There is, however, another enemy, more subtle and more respectable, whose approaches can only be met by argument founded on accurate and well marshalled information. This enemy is the modern scientific Socialism, which employs as its weapon the now popular hypothesis of Evolution. Here again we must distinguish between the crudely secularist and really anti-social dogmatism which appears to have its origin in Germany, and the patient reasoning and high moral purpose which are found in the speculations of such writers as Mr. H. G. Wells. It is quite plain that Christianity can have neither part nor lot in an ideal polity which regulates the sexual relation on simply material lines, mating human animals, as a stockbreeder mates his beasts, solely with a view to obtaining certain qualities in the offspring; or, at the other extreme, is ready to dispense with the social value of the strongest of human emotions, allowing them to run to waste in "the incidental and loose relations of individual and temporary desire".¹ It is indeed difficult to believe that such views of the destiny of marriage exercise an influence on the thought and conduct of normal human beings, though there is evidence that they are getting a hold among the working classes in Germany. And it is at all events permissible to hope that their influence will be evanescent; and that their prophets have fallen here also into that disregard of human nature as a factor in the problem, which invalidates so much of their most brilliant and attractive reasoning.

The more thoughtful and reverent school of Socialist thought presents a much more difficult and suggestive problem. In Mr. Wells's tract, *Socialism and the Family*, there are two points which strike the reader: first, that in the main lines of his argument the writer is

¹ F. G. Peabody, *Jesus Christ and the Social Question*, p. 143.

preaching naked Christianity ; and second, that the principles for which he is contending have already, in great measure, been accepted in practice. Yet, for all that, it remains possible that some of his conclusions are based upon an incomplete induction, and vitiated by a confusion between things which are not *in pari materia*.

When Mr. Wells "proposes to give a man no more property in a woman than a woman has in a man", and so to "recognize in theory what in many classes is already the fact,—the practical equality of men and women in a civilized state",¹ we can go with him. When he tells us that "the socialist is prepared for an insistence upon intelligence and self-restraint quite beyond the current practice",² we cannot dispute the justice of the implied criticism. But when he speaks of marriage as "a relation which every year seems more limiting, and (except for its temporary passional aspect) purposeless",³ and declares that "we live in a world of stupendous hypocrisies, a world wherein rakes and rascals champion the sacred institution of the family ; and a net-work of sexual secrets, vaguely suspected, disagreeably present, and only half concealed, pervades every social group one enters",⁴ he seems to be arguing from a partial survey of the facts, and to be hastily taking the clamorous discontented few as representative of the silent mass. Our experience is happily different. In the world as we know it, the "way of a man with a maid" is not an unclean mystery, the butt of prurient curiosity and leering innuendo, but a pleasant wholesome idyll. The solemn, passionate words of the Marriage Service, "for better, for worse, for richer, for poorer, in sickness and in health, to love and to cherish, till death us do part," are not felt to be either a hyperbole or a galling chain ; nor, as experience proves, do they express an unattainable ideal, but a most blessed commonplace of life.

With regard to the second point mentioned above, the practical acceptance of the socialist principle, it is undeniable in more things perhaps, than we quite realize. The first Factory Act marks its entry into our legislation ; and has been followed by a long series of Acts of Parliament, and Municipal By-laws. And in this particular it is worth while to observe, that the socialist principle, in so far as it involves renunciation or transfer of parental responsibility, was voluntarily adopted by the rich long before it was enforced upon the poorer classes.

It is now proposed to extend the same principle to more intimate and delicate human relations. The State, already Over Landlord and Over Employer, is to be Over Parent too. This train of reasoning is not without attractions for the logical mind : but a fallacy lurks in the premisses. The history of socialistic enterprise, in its successes and its failures alike, marks out clearly the possibilities and the limitations of its application. A large measure of socialism is necessary and beneficial in all matters which concern the bodily and economic welfare of the citizen : in what we may call the intellectual side of education, and, through it in the formation of character. But for

¹ p. 57.² p. 58.³ p. 35.⁴ p. 40.

the primary and essential education of character, for the training of the soul, the family is the ideal unit, not the State. There is no nursery of the Christian spirit which can be depended on, except the Christian home.

5. The standing argument of the advocates of State control is the existence of a large proportion of homes which do not approximate to any such ideal. Too many bad parents, parents who are unfit to have the charge of children, are found in every class : and, in extreme cases, the law rightly provides for the removal of children from their control. But it does not follow that it is either wise or just, for their sakes, to rob good parents of their freedom to serve the State in ways which freedom alone makes possible. It is the business of Christianity to form good parents, and convert bad ones. In the words of Dr. Creighton, "We must make it clear that we are not maintaining antiquated ecclesiastical prejudices, but are upholding the principles on which Family life is founded." Let us recognize frankly that in these matters it is not the day for ecclesiastical authority. In questions of belief and conduct, no one whose support is worth having will "hear the Church", unless it can appeal to reason and moral sense.

There is another thing whose day should be past, too, if the honourable estate of Matrimony is to do its just work in the Christian Life, and abide as the cornerstone of Christian society ; and that is the ignorance, miscalled innocence, outcome of timidity, and false shame, and indolence, which sends youths and maidens unprepared, to meet the solemn obligations and duties of marriage. The time of innocence for our young people is ended, by a flood of literature dealing grossly or seductively with the carnal side of the sexual relation ; which, in the conditions of modern life, the most guarded can hardly escape. Will not their souls be required at our hands, if we fail to put before them the facts in their true setting ; if we deny them the counsels of wisdom and self-control, while we allow them to steep their minds in the pictured allurements of sense, the records of lawless passion, the stupid or wilful misrepresentation of the deeper and more lasting elements in marriage.

It is surely the duty of the Church to speak out on these subjects with no uncertain voice ; and in its public and private teaching, and in the lives of its professed followers, to keep ever before itself, and before the world, an ideal of Christian marriage, which will attract by its beauty, and convince by its innate reasonableness.

[Published for the Pan-Anglican Congress Committees, who alone are responsible for these Papers.]

SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE.

LONDON : NORTHUMBERLAND AVENUE, W.C.

PAN-ANGLICAN PAPERS

Being Problems for consideration at the *Pan-Anglican Congress*, 1908. ‘

THE SANCTITY OF MARRIAGE

By BISHOP DOANE

I AM quite sure that in order to get the first impression of the sanctity of marriage, we have need to go back and learn the sacredness and dignity of the human body. We have so long been used to that mistranslation of St. Paul's statement about "the body of our humiliation" (the vile body), that we have come to associate the physical part of our nature with an idea of essential uncleanness; and, so doing, we forget that it was "made in the image of God", that our Lord took unto Himself human nature; that it is "the temple of the Holy Ghost"; and that it has in it the seed and germ, which, in the great day of resurrection, is to rise and be fashioned into the likeness of the body of Christ's Glory. First of all this needs to be carefully and wisely impressed upon children. There is a period of childhood when ignorance safeguards innocence, but there comes a time when children need wise and loving direction to guard them against the temptations which begin to assail them; and this must come from the father or mother, first and best of all. Textbooks on physiology, careful but thorough, are of use, but the real root of the matter is too delicate to be dealt with by a book, or a teacher to a class. And yet the child ought to come to a knowledge of its physical nature, not first by the presence and pressure of its developing demands, much less from the suggestion of evil companions, or the dangerous intimations of the so-called love story, in which lust masks itself under the name of love, and sensuousness is thinly veiled by sentimentality. Guarded in advance as to the grace of chastity in women or the virtue of continence in men, they might be saved from the start. And in the midst of the fearful warnings of ruin and misery, of seductions and suicides, of murders to conceal the other sin, there is plainly a call for more carefulness in dealing with boys and girls as to their reading, as to their exposure to the excitement of sensational dramas, as to their relations to each other, unprotected and unguarded, as to their knowledge of themselves; and somehow it must be impressed upon people, that purity and chastity are to be required and demanded of men as well as of women.

That old motto, "nil dictu visuve foedum haec limina tangat intra quae puer est," ought to be written over the threshold of the boys' home and the boys' school; and because marriage deals in part with the question of the flesh, of the passions of the animal nature, the dignity of the human body ought to be the foundation thought from which to build up the great fact of the sanctity of marriage. It is not the mating of animals, it is the union of two entire natures, each made in the image and stamped with the holiness and honour of creation and redemption, "into one flesh."

Then comes naturally and necessarily the thought of the inherent holiness of the relation before and apart from and even without the blessing of the Church. It is in itself a holy estate. What the Roman Church calls "the sacrament of marriage" (not without justification), what in other religious bodies is called "holy matrimony", is not really the marriage of two people, but the Church's benediction on their marriage, and if the Church does not, neither does the State, marry them. They marry each other, under the sanction, protection, and restriction of law, civil and ecclesiastical. When two people enter into an agreement to become man and wife, the common law recognizes them as married, if the agreement has been duly witnessed and recorded. The Priest or Magistrate is only called to give the sanction of the Church or of the State to the act.

Besides this, it must be recognized that marriage is an estate of life, continuous and permanent; that it is defined in a religious way by what the holy Scriptures say of it, and described by the statute in a civil and legal sense. The scriptural definition beyond all peradventure, whether in the language of its institution in Genesis, or in the language of its re-affirmation in the Gospels, is, that marriage is the union of one man and one woman for life. The most extreme extension of the words in one of the Gospels furnishes only one possible ground of dissolution of the contract (except death), namely, adultery; and while separation and divorce are recognized in the civil law, the causes, too many in some instances, are very accurately defined.

It may broadly and generally be assumed that when two people enter into a contract of marriage, it is implied and understood that they enter into this mutual relation for life. So, then, the great need of the time seems to be to impress upon men and women the seriousness, sacredness, and solemnity of marriage, that "it may not be entered into", as the prayer book of the Episcopal Church says, "unadvisedly, or lightly, but reverently, discreetly, advisedly, soberly, and in the fear of God." It is a sufficient indication of the seriousness of marriage that, as one has said, it is the only contract which a man and woman make *for life*, and the only contract that *cannot end by mutual consent*; the only contract for life that is *legally binding* and the only contract that is legally binding for more than a year, that is *not expressed in writing*. There are certain provisions of law which make for greater carefulness about marriage; the required licence, the required age, the consent of parents or guardians, the question of consanguinity. There ought to be more legal safeguards. And there

are certain canons and expressions of the Christian Church which throw an atmosphere about marriage indicating and insisting upon its dignity and its unique character.

And then with what seems almost "gilding refined gold" the Church takes her stand and asserts her strong conviction in the service that gives the blessing to the two coming to make their vows in the presence of the Priest. "In Santa Croce's holy precincts lie ashes that make them holier." So one may say that the Church's office for the solemnization of matrimony enhances and enforces its sanctity. It is called in the book of common prayer "holy matrimony", and we remember that this adjective is kept for only three other of the divine institutions, Holy Baptism, Holy Communion, Holy Orders. Not even the Laying on of Hands is honoured with this description. *Holy Confirmation* is a modern misuse of words. Only, with the two greater sacraments, and with the ministry, marriage seems to take this almost sacred place, having in very truth not only its "outward sign" but also its "inward grace", the very "grace of life", of which the man and the woman are heirs together: being, as St. Paul calls it, *μυστήριον*, which is sacrament in Greek; lacking the two descriptive characteristics, which mark the greater sacraments in our Anglican use, in that it was *not* "ordained by Christ Himself", and is *not* "generally necessary to salvation". And yet one hesitates to say that it was not ordained by Christ Himself; because He took it from its primeval institution and renewed its original honour when he adopted as His own its characteristic description. "They are no more twain but one flesh." "What therefore God has joined together let no man put asunder."

"The honourable estate instituted of God in the time of man's innocency signifying unto us the mystical union that is betwixt Christ and His Church; which holy estate Christ adorned and beautified with His presence and first miracle that He wrought in Cana of Galilee"; this is the Church's description of what marriage is; changing, one might say, the common water of the mere civil act into the rich wine of a mysterious and sacred meaning. Again, the Church speaks of it as "the holy estate of Matrimony", as "God's holy ordinance", and pronounces them man and wife "in the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost", adding the benediction in the Triune Name.

Here in America we are compelled to strain every nerve in our insistence upon the sanctity of marriage, because, I grieve to say, the country has gained a shameful and sorrowful pre-eminence in what one might almost call "the divorce habit", the statistics of which are alarming and shocking to the last degree. Slowly and steadily the public conscience is being stirred. Not only in Ecclesiastical bodies, but in the Legislatures and in Conferences called by the civil authorities, there is a widespread and strong movement toward reducing the causes for divorce *a vinculo*, and toward arresting the possibility of re-marriage, if not to the one only possible scriptural exception, at least to only six causes at the outside. Meanwhile the

safeguards against hasty and ill-considered marriages are coming to be more carefully defined and, in many States, increased. With the door of entrance into the Holy Estate guarded and consecrated, it is hoped that the door of exit, "the shameful divorce court," may some day be closed.

[Published for the Pan-Anglican Congress Committees, who alone are responsible for these Papers.]

SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE.

LONDON: NORTHUMBERLAND AVENUE, W.C.

1908.

PAN-ANGLICAN PAPERS

Being Problems for consideration at the *Pan-Anglican Congress*, 1908.

LAW AND CUSTOMS OF MARRIAGE IN NON-CHRISTIAN LANDS (S. AFRICA OR AFRICA) AS BEARING ON MISSION DIFFICULTIES

By THE BISHOP OF ST. JOHN'S, KAFFRARIA

So far as the Anglican Communion is concerned this subject may at once be narrowed down in South Africa to the customs of the several Bantu races, commonly, though inexactly and unreasonably, known as Kafirs. Polygamy is said to have been "tolerated" among the Bushmen,¹ and "recognized" among the Hottentots.² But the former are almost extinct—the census of 1891 returned only 5,296 as their number;³ while the Hottentot proper is dying out in British South Africa. In 1891 their number was 42,891,⁴ and they are not directly the object of any of the missions of the South African Province. So far as this paper is concerned, the tribes chiefly in view will be those dwelling within the diocese of St. John's. This comprises the "Transkeian Territories", i.e. the great native reserve which lies between Cape Colony proper, bounded on the south by the Great Kei River (or Inciba), and on the north by Natal. The problems are indicated by the two words Polygamy, and Lobola, or cattle dowry.

Of these Polygamy is undoubtedly the most formidable question with which the missionary has at present to deal. It is practically universal among the Bantu folk, and it penetrates the whole of the highly organized life of these peoples. Here it may be well to guard against what appears to be a prevalent misconception. South Africa is no longer the unknown country of the nineties; but if the country be known, the people, or peoples, are not. The Briton does not yet know the Dutch; while his ignorance of the native is, as yet, the darker for the partial knowledge which he has gained of him on the Rand, or in the Kimberley compounds, or in other centres of population. The native is naturally reticent. He is not less suspicious of strangers than, say, the Briton himself. The last person to whom he would be likely to disclose his mind would be the casual stranger or the traveller in a hurry; and natives on the mines of the Rand would give about as good a presentment of real native life as would

¹ *Natives of South Africa* (Murray, 1901), p. 1.

² Quoted *Ibid.*, p. 9.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 4.

⁴ *Ibid.*

be given, say, by the Cornish miners who also work there of the life and habits of North Cornwall.

In the Transkei, by which in this paper is meant the whole of the Transkeian Territories, life is not in villages, but in what are practically village communities. It is highly organized; and it has an intensely conservative bias which bids fair to outlast the breaking up of the tribes. If the men, for whatever motive, go away for work—and they do go in very large numbers—this sort of work is incidental and for a special purpose. They intend to resume their country life. And this is not an idle life. As farmers or peasants their habits of work will compare favourably with those of the same class elsewhere in South Africa, of whatever race. They are not simply a collection of vagrants, whom the white man has for once induced to work—for their good—but part of a real society; and of this society as it exists polygamy is one of the fundamental institutions.¹ It is not a desire for sensual indulgence. It is the foundation of their home life, as marriage is elsewhere the foundation of all society; and it is regulated by rigid tradition.

Putting aside the case of chiefs, whose principal wife is in most tribes presented to the chief by the tribe after his accession to office, the first wife is a man's great or principal wife. He would commonly receive her from his parents, who would have arranged the marriage with the parents of the bride, probably without much consultation of her wishes, and possibly without consulting their son. He would certainly look forward to choosing later a second wife for himself. His parents would have provided the lobola, or cattle dowry, for the chief wife; for the second he would provide lobola himself, and, in order to procure the necessary cattle, would probably go out to work in the towns. This second wife, known as the right-hand wife, would have a separate kraal, and her children would inherit separately from those of the great wife. If a third wife be taken, she would in some tribes become the left-hand wife; but most commonly she would be attached to the kraal of the great wife,² and, if the latter were childless, her children would be reckoned as the children of the great wife, and her eldest son would be his father's heir, in precedence of those of the right-hand wife. They would in fact be in precisely the same position as the children of Bilhah, Rachel's handmaid. This third wife would thus be, no doubt, a concubine in the same sense; but the union is legalized according to native custom, and this secondary wife is known as iqadi, or a rafter, of the great house. A fourth wife, if one be taken, is similarly attached to the right-hand house. The iqadi is attached to a kraal of one of the wives, but she has her own hut; and in the Transkei her husband pays hut tax on that hut, on the understanding that she has a wifely status.

In the case of chiefs, certainly, the wives would each have their own establishment, sometimes at a considerable distance apart, and the husband would travel from one to the other. An attempt was made

¹ *Natives of South Africa*, p. 230.

² South African Native Affairs Commission, 1903-5, Evidence, Qu. 13372.

some years ago by a distinguished politician to qualify the status of a polygamist native's wives as practically slavery, and on this was founded an argument in favour of ever so slight a compulsion to labour, with a view, certainly, to provision for the mines, but also with the happy result of freeing native women. There is reason to believe that this view came dangerously near to being accepted as authoritative; but nothing could be further from the truth. It is based on the view of the native male as an incurable idler, whereas he is nothing of the sort. His women work, no doubt; but so does he. In old days he was fighter, hunter, litigant, master of cattle; and, if the course of events has deprived him of nearly all his occupations, time was needed for readjustment; and he is every year increasingly habituating himself to work on the land side by side with his women. On the other hand it is clear that the larger the number of women belonging to his household, the lighter will be the work of each of them. But as a matter of fact the women are said to approve of polygamy from another point of view. To belong to a great household is in itself a matter of pride.¹ It involves status and position.

The form of marriage is one of strict observance. It varies no doubt at different times and places,² but lobola, or cattle dowry is a constant feature: "that is to say, so many cattle are given for the woman. . . . So soon as the dowry has been paid, she is equipped and sent off to the man who asks for her. Usually she is sent off with a party. When the girl arrives at her destination a beast is killed, that is, blood is shed, signifying, I suppose, that the agreement of marriage has been sealed between the two. Then, as the ceremony proceeds, a beast is killed in the several stages of the ceremony, to signify the shedding of the blood, until the conclusion of the ceremony. At other times there is what is called umdudo, which is shown sometimes by a great dance. . . . When all this has been concluded, the girl is declared to be a wife."³ All these ceremonies would only take place in the case of the great wife. Even in her case part would often be dispensed with; and at the present time some marriages take place with the barest minimum; though never without something, even if it be only the promise of the dowry cattle, by which the solemn intention is shown. About polygamy of this sort, two things are clear. First, it is inwrought into the very life of the people; and, secondly, there is nothing casual, or incidental, or haphazard. It is not a device for sensual indulgence. Clearly, this is a thing which deserves, and indeed demands, to be treated with respect.

The legal position is, indeed, a perplexing one. For Cape Colony proper, the position is settled by a judgement of the Supreme Court, which declines to recognize a polygamous marriage.⁴ By this the Court appears to understand a marriage which is *potentially* polygamous,

¹ *Natives of South Africa*, p. 28.

² *Ibid.*, Note 2:—"Something must pass between the parties to make the contract lawful. In times of scarcity and distress a basket of corn has been considered sufficient. Hoes of native manufacture, or indeed anything can be paid."

³ S.A.N.A.C., Qu. 6,712: cf. 6,071 and 6,075.

⁴ S.A.N.A.C., Qu. 5,763: cf. 10,152-6.

for it does not recognize even a first marriage if it have been made according to native custom merely ; it recognizes no native marriage unless performed before a Government marriage officer. Consequently the local inferior Courts can entertain no claim as regards dowry, &c. The result is certainly unfortunate. These marriages are, no doubt, very far from reaching the Christian standard of absolute indissolubility ; but the native recognizes them as constituting a binding tie, not to be lightly broken. The lobola is partly a guarantee of this. If a husband repudiates a wife without adequate reason, she returns to her father's kraal, and retains there the cattle which her husband gave as her lobola.¹ On the other hand, if the wife desert her husband, her parents are bound to aid him in bringing her back ; failing this, there may be a claim on the husband's part to recover the cattle.² This is by old native law ; so that, to the raw native, as we call him, marriage as a binding engagement is at the base of a stable society. The refusal of the Courts to recognize the value of his marriage engagement must place them to him at a lower moral level than his own ; for he can know nothing of their ulterior aim, which is, no doubt, his emancipation from polygamy.

The Courts of the Transkei, on the other hand, while bound by the Superior Courts of the Colony, are allowed to modify their practice by admitting native custom, where it is not clearly contrary to good morals. In them these polygamous marriages are treated as real marriages, and claims for dowry cattle, &c., are entertained as a matter of course. Probably the magistrates, like the missionaries, of the Transkei would say that a very large proportion of their time is taken up with the intricacies of marriage disputes.

What then is the view and the policy of the Church in dealing with these unions?

It has varied a good deal from time to time and in different dioceses, and it varies still. The variation is even greater when one goes outside the Church, with the inevitable result that it becomes most difficult to maintain that comity with regard to the ecclesiastical discipline of other bodies which we all desire and which most of us endeavour to preserve. In 1902, with a view to laying the foundation of more uniform practice, the Bishops of the Province in Synod appointed a committee to collect information not only from other Christian bodies in South Africa, but from all Christian missions throughout the world. Abundant information was received ; but so great was the divergence of practice that it has proved impossible at present to arrive at any coherent conclusions.

But, within the Church, it appears clear that the change of view has tended all one way—from a not unnatural disposition to disparage these unions, to a wider and more sympathetic consideration. We can readily understand that the first missionaries would reject altogether the idea of polygamy as constituting a marriage union at all. In this case the institution of lobola would further degrade it ; for on the

¹ Ibid., Qu. 5,789.

² Ibid., Qu. 13411-12.

surface it does certainly lend colour to the estimate, still held by some, of native marriage as being the mere purchase of a woman by a man, merely a commercial transaction. Hence it was to be no bar to Christian baptism. These women, not being wives, could be at once put away. The connexion, such as it was, was in itself a sinful union, and the sooner it was terminated, the better for all concerned. Thus an early missionary speaks of "the extent to which *this vice* is practised";¹ and again: "it is a violation of God's holy ordinance on the subject";² a statement no doubt true in the abstract, but true of the Bantu folk only in the sense in which it is true of the Hebrew patriarchs. In some cases it seems to have been at once perceived that the great wife occupied a special position, that she was in fact in some sort a real wife, and the convert was advised to marry her, or this may even have been made a condition of baptism. Other missionaries would, however, permit, or even encourage, marriage with another woman outside the circle of the deserted wives. Indeed it has from time to time been made a reproach to missionaries that their converts were attracted by the opportunity of getting rid of their existing establishments, and marrying a younger woman, possibly without having to pay lobola for her, if that happened to be the rule of the community which he was about to join.

This phase is reflected in the second part of a resolution passed by the Synod of South African Bishops in 1883. "A previous native marriage-union or contract is not of so close or binding a character as that of Christian marriage, and need be no bar to a Christian marriage with another person after conversion, provided all previous legal obligations have been fully discharged."³ This resolution, with others bearing on the subject, has been suspended, having been referred by the Bishops to the consideration of the next Provincial Missionary Conference.

But experience has led missionaries to change their estimate of these marriages. In the first place, in the diocese of St. John's at least, there is a practically universal consensus as to the value of lobola. It is seen clearly that to describe a native as purchasing his wife is a grotesque misstatement. There is indeed a danger at times of our desire not to interfere with native customs bolstering up what is really degenerate, even from a native point of view. This was made abundantly clear three years ago in the case of what are known as Ntonjane ceremonies.⁴ These had degenerated within the time of living men, as they readily admitted; and we appeared on the scene in time to crystallize the corruption and prevent such a reform as possibly the natives might have carried out had they been left to themselves. But in regard to lobola there is no such degeneration. One of the most experienced magistrates of the Transkei tells us: "I consider dowry the very fundamental principle upon which the whole social and moral system of the native race is based, and I think personally

¹ Shaw, *Story of my Mission*, p. 420.

² ? Ibid.

³ *Constitution and Canons of the Province* (1904), p. 79.

⁴ Transkeian General Council. Report, 1905, p. 10.

the system of dowry should be adhered to to the very last moment.”¹ No doubt all pecuniary considerations in relation to marriage lend themselves readily to its degradation, and lobola is no exception; but this is not peculiar to polygamy, nor to Bantu races. Our experience too has proved that there need be nothing in the practice of lobola which should be in the least degree repugnant to a sensitive Christian conscience.

Next, it has become possible to see that a polygamous marriage is, or may be, a real marriage. No doubt it is below the Christian standard; but that is not the question. We are not proposing to baptize polygamists, but to determine the value of the marriage; and the standard allowed to Hebrew patriarchs can scarcely be condemned as sinful in the case of native peoples. Unless we are prepared to annul the marriage of Jacob and Rachel, we must surely accept these marriages as at any rate on the same level. They are real marriages; real, but not Christian, not indissoluble. Real so far that, as opportunity serves, they appear to rank in St. Paul's sense with marriage, viz. that “if of two partners to a monogamic heathen marriage, one become a Christian, but the other be nevertheless willing still to continue in the conjugal union, the Christian partner is not to put the heathen one away; but if the heathen partner dissolve the marriage, the Christian is free to marry again.”²

Are then the partners to a polygamous marriage subjects for baptism? In the case of the man clearly not. “No man still living as a polygamist can be admitted to Baptism or to the grade of Catechumen.”³ “A polygamist, on conversion, and before baptism, must put away all his wives but one, arranging if necessary for their support.”⁴ But this does not really touch the difficulty of the question. The husband cannot be accepted for baptism; he is a polygamist: but can the wife? Is she a polygamist because her husband has other spouses? She at least has only one. Is she to be penalized because of her husband's act, of which she is not guilty, and from which she cannot escape? But then, we now no longer advise the husband to put away his wives. Such certainly was the animus of the Act just quoted. A polygamist desiring to embrace Christianity would have been advised then to put away his wives, as of course. That was Bishop Key's view when the Act was passed. But I am in a position to know that that wise-hearted missionary altered his judgement in this matter. He became more impressed with the moral perils which threatened the repudiated women. One old missionary has stated that he had never known a case in which women thus put away that their husband might be baptized had not fallen into sin. And Bishop Key came to hold

¹ S.A.N.A.C., Qu. 13,538-41.

² *Acts, &c., of the Diocese of St. John's* (1902), XVI. 3. By ‘monogamic’ I understand, under our circumstances, the case where a man has either not proceeded to a second (polygamous) marriage or else has put away all wives but one, and so remains ‘monogamic’.

³ *Constitution and Canons*, p. 79. The rule is that of the South African Province, quoted without reference to different opinions held elsewhere.

⁴ *Acts, &c.*, XVI. 1.

that a man had no right to win the covenanted blessing for himself at the risk of the souls of his wives. Then are we to refuse to allow him to put away his wives, and at the same time to admit the wives themselves to baptism? And is not this indeed to penalize the husband this time?

This, however, is the custom in the diocese of St. John's. Nominally the Bishop is held to weigh the claims of each case; for the Bishops of the Province have resolved that "the wife of a polygamist, not allowed by her husband to leave him, may not be admitted to the Catechumenate or to Holy Baptism without the special sanction of the Bishop, after he shall have fully considered the circumstances in each individual case";¹ but the diocese stands alone in the Province in its action. The question is in fact a complicated one. The Basuto missionaries state that it would be impossible thus to receive the wives of a Mosuto polygamist, or at least the inferior wives, on the ground that they have no control over their own persons, which may be placed by their husband at the disposal of a guest. This is a practice which is also found among the Basuto who have migrated east of the Drakensberg into the Transkei; but it is believed to be absolutely unknown among the "Kafirs".

Thus in South Africa practice in this matter is by no means settled, but it will be impossible permanently to acquiesce in the divergence which at present prevails; and it is not at all certain that the practice of generally admitting the wives while precluding the husband has really worked well on the whole.

It is possible that another course might be adopted, which would at least have the important merit of meting out equal treatment to husband and wives. The wives, it is true, are not polygamist; but they are certainly parties, as well as their husband, to a polygamous union. Without any desire to press an analogy which would be misleading, this is seen at once in the case of polyandry. No one, it is presumed, would propose to admit the husband of a polyandrous union to baptism. The polygamists, men and women, might, it is suggested, be admitted to a special class. There appears to be no reason why their polygamy should exclude them from the classes of inquirers and catechumens; and then, when they are ready for baptism, seeing that they have, *ex hypothesi*, the further qualification beyond other candidates of being willing to wait in patience until God's will is made clear for them, they might form a class, say, of Expectants, ranking next after the baptized and admitted to all Church privileges save the actual reception of the Sacraments.

Such a plan might be tolerable as a temporary measure; and in South Africa nothing further is needed. We are told on all hands that polygamy is doomed.² "I do not think that it is necessary," says one of the most expert witnesses, "to prohibit polygamy, because I think it is gradually dying out." No one seems to be quite sure of

¹ *Constitution and Canons*, p. 79.

² S.A.N.A.C., Qu. 3,259; 3,262; 4,620-1; 5,753; 6,060; 6,745; 7,593; 10,037; 15,539, and *passim*.

the reason. It is because of the rinderpest and the consequent scarcity of cattle ; or because the wars are over, and, as men are no longer killed, the number of the sexes is becoming equalized ; or, says one native witness who really knows his people, it is " the result of natural causes ". Whatever the cause, the trend is certainly all in one direction. When polygamy is gone, new and serious problems must at once arise in this virile race. But as we watch, and assist, the passing of the old order, there is the clearest duty of sympathy and patience.

[Published for the Pan-Anglican Congress Committees, who alone are responsible for these Papers.]

SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE.

LONDON : NORTHUMBERLAND AVENUE, W.C.

1908

S. A. 1^d

PAN-ANGLICAN PAPERS

Being Problems for consideration at the *Pan-Anglican Congress*, 1908.

CHRISTIANITY AND MARRIAGE QUESTIONS IN JAPAN

BY THE BISHOP OF SOUTH TOKYO

(BISHOP WILLIAM AWDRY, D.D.)

MARRIAGE conditions, customs, and laws have been exceedingly lax in Japan ; but three great forces :—(1) Philosophy, (2) Government, and (3) Christianity, are earnestly engaged in tightening the marriage bond, each conscious of the others' work, yet not taking much apparent notice of each other.

I. PHILOSOPHY

That "Marriage should be the union of one man with one woman on equal terms as long as the two lives last is one of the first principles of practical ethics" is the statement of Mr. Fukuzawa and the school of educationalists, moralists, and philosophers which has grown up under his influence—a statement gravely put forth in a summary of the principles of practical ethics which they compiled some six or seven years ago, in view of the likelihood that Mr. Fukuzawa himself might not be much longer among them. Neither he nor they were Christians. The doctrine was, therefore, not accepted on authority but on its own merits, as judged by persons who were "proving all things" that came under their cognizance from East or West, and "holding fast that which is good" as it appeared to them in the interest of their country and of mankind.

I need hardly say that this doctrine does not express even the ideal of any part of heathendom ; but it is the ideal of marriage in Christendom derived directly from our Lord Himself and from nowhere else.

An idea lingers still, even in England, and would be freely acknowledged throughout heathendom and Japan, that the sin of a married man in offending with an unmarried woman is different in kind and much less in degree than that of any man, married or unmarried,

offending with a married woman. The sin in the latter case is considered adultery ; in the former case it may be fornication ; it is bad form, inconsistent, except under special circumstances to be mentioned presently, with the highest type of character, but yet a peccadillo compared with adultery.

This distinction rests upon the axiom, recognized or unrecognized, that the woman is not merely "for the man" (1 Cor. xi. 9), but is in some sense his property by marriage in a way in which the man is not the woman's property by marriage ; and thus adultery is of the nature of robbery, where the crime is not against the property but against the owner of the property. Adultery is regarded as an offence against the husband, not the wife, and it is supposed that there can be no such thing as adultery if the woman does not belong to a husband.

Our Lord's words, "He committeth adultery *against her*," against *the woman*, implying that Christian marriage is a union on equal terms as between the two sexes, were a startling and seemingly impossible novelty even to the disciples themselves (St. Matt. xix. 10). It is a revelation from our Lord's lips. And that this revelation has approved itself to a school of non-christian moral philosophers in Japan, however small as yet their following, is a fact of the highest significance and importance.

The method of the philosophers is, of course, simply influence by ideals and examples, and undoubtedly Mr. Fukuzawa's domestic life was in full accord with his teaching.

Before proceeding to the ways in which the Government is tightening the marriage bond, it is necessary to say something of the peculiar customs of the Japanese with regard to adoption, and marriage formalities.

The family is an entity, recognized by the law, which must not lightly be allowed to die out, nor to be merged in another without express consent of the authorities. If a man has no child by his wife, he chooses and adopts an heir ; and as the heir is not merely to inherit the property, but to continue the family, he may in fulfilling his duty to his ancestors and to the state prefer to adopt a son of his own born out of wedlock, or, without the slightest wish to separate from his wedded wife, he may beget a son elsewhere to become her son by adoption, just as Abraham did. It will be observed that this need imply no laxity of morals and no selfishness, but only a great difference of social custom. It will probably have to be modified if social relations are to become very close between Japanese and Western peoples whose

marriage law largely rests on Christ's teaching ; but it would be a great mistake to regard it as either low or loose. It is part of a complete social system, and conformity to it may often involve genuine self-denial and self-sacrifice.

Adoption in Japan, as in the East generally, is recognized as in all respects equivalent to birth into the family. It is astonishing to us Western people, and very confusing, to find what a large proportion of the men within the circle of our own acquaintance thus change their surnames through transfer from one family to another.

In some cases difficulties are not unlikely to arise, for a son may be born of the wife after the adoption has taken place, or the first wife may die and a second wife may prove fruitful ; yet the adoption was a legal matter, and if the motive was to provide a head for a family which would otherwise die out, it is an affair of the state. Again, there may be daughters but no son. A woman can be heir to the headship of the family, and in that case usually some one is adopted to marry the heiress and carry on the family. His rights are limited, and his position in the family is often uncomfortable. But since one family must not be merged in another, it follows that if a man so adopted afterwards through any circumstances becomes the head of his own family, the marriage of the two, even if already consummated, would be dissolved by the death of the parents unless one or other of the families chooses another head. The choice to the headship of a family rests with the family council, a legal institution which has authority in such matters as marriage, divorce, adoption, competence to manage the family affairs, &c., and as, after the selection of one to continue the father's family, each of the other brothers probably becomes the founder of a new family, it is plain that cases in which the prospective headship of a family may affect the stability of a marriage are not uncommon. The formalities which go to constitute marriage in Japan are peculiar and very seriously separate the Christian from the non-Christian idea of marriage. There are two parts in a Japanese marriage, one social, the other civic. The social rite is practically indispensable. Outside Christian circles it almost always takes place first, generally some months before the other. Indeed the civic rite is very often dispensed with altogether, and yet the parties are fully recognized in society as man and wife. The essential feature of the social rite is that the bride and bridegroom drink out of the same cup in the presence of the two persons who have brought them together and become the witnesses to and guardians of the marriage. As soon as this is over the two live together

in all honour as Mr. and Mrs. So-and-so. But as yet they are not legally man and wife. In the public register every woman is on the roll of some man who is for the time being the head of her family. When the head of her family in agreement with her husband or the head of his family gets her name struck off his roll and entered on her husband's roll, then and not till then the law knows of the marriage: she changes her legal name, and children born of the two are legitimate. The ease and frequency of adoption makes legitimacy comparatively unimportant, for nothing could be more easy and natural than to adopt your own illegitimate children, especially as, when the parents have been living together recognized as man and wife, there is no slur on the children's parentage.

It is the office of the woman's father to take the initiative in the legalizing of marriage by registration, and it would be somewhat rude of the husband to urge this upon the father. For this and for other reasons the registration is generally deferred till it can be seen whether the woman will get on well with the husband and his family, whether the marriage is likely to be fruitful, &c. The woman's father is thus able to take her back if necessary for her happiness, or the husband's family to send her back if she does not get on well with them, without any public scandal. As the wife is not the head woman of the family so long as her husband's mother is alive, and a man cannot change his mother but can change his wife, such cases of separation for incompatibility after the social marriage is consummated cannot fail to be common. Even after registration they probably are not rare; but in that case a divorce by reference to the authorities for the cancelling of registration is necessary. In all cases the witnesses to the marriage, and the heads of the families, must be consenting parties; but where separation is desired, the reasons which cause the desire probably are operative on both sides, and those who represent each side are probably more solicitous for the happiness of the parties whom they represent than for the permanence of the marriage tie: so consent is very easily obtained.

2. GOVERNMENT

We may notice four matters in which recent Government action has worked towards raising the ideal of marriage.

(a) The Emperor himself, when the Crown Prince was to be married, ordered a ceremonial to be formulated for marriages in the Royal Family. The ceremonial adopted is of great interest; but what we are

concerned with here is that henceforward marriages of the Royal Family were to be regarded as matters of public concern, not merely domestic affairs. Hence, also, the dissolution of such a marriage cannot now be a merely domestic matter. This example in the highest rank cannot fail to have a great effect in adding solemnity to marriage.

(b) Again, from the new civil code the word for concubine has disappeared altogether, though a remnant of old ideas is left in the word expressing the natural son adopted into the family by the father.

(c) During the recent war, the families of soldiers who had died without having their marriages made legal by registration found, often to their great surprise, that they were wholly unrecognized by the law. Thus many thousands of them needed special assistance outside the law, and many thousands of soldiers' marriages were registered during the war that the wives might be entitled to benefits. This cannot fail to bring prompt registration more into vogue with the humbler classes, since every Japanese under a system of conscription is presumably a soldier.

(d) The new civil code gives the woman practically the same right as the man to initiate proceedings for divorce. Where divorce is so easy and so frequent as in Japan, where people so much dislike public attention being called to their family affairs, and where, moreover, the wife need not greatly fear divorce, if it is not her own fault, because it carries very little stigma and is no bar to remarriage; this provision tends to make the man more thoughtful in entering upon marriage, and more careful how he does what is likely to break it off. Probably this purpose was not absent from the mind of the legislators.

3. CHRISTIANITY

The Christian Japanese are doing much to raise the character of marriage in Japan; chiefly by drawing together on principle the dates of the social and the legal rite. In the canon on marriage in force among the members of our communion the sentences bearing on this point run as follows: "Persons desiring to be married shall, three days in advance, prepare the notice of marriage required by the law of the land, and present the same to the officiating clergyman. Persons who have already given the legal notice shall present a copy of the official register."

"The officiating clergyman shall, immediately after the marriage, enter upon the register (of the Church) the domicile, residence, age,

and rank of the parties, the names of their parents, and the place and date of the marriage, and shall together with the parties and two witnesses sign and seal the (Church) register, and shall give the former a copy of the registration.

“The parties shall, immediately after the ceremony, give notice of their marriage to the (civil) registrar, and shall give notice of their having done so to the officiating clergyman.”

When first carried, some six years ago, this canon ventured only to require that care should be taken at the time of the service in Church to see that civil registration should be in a fair way to being carried out as soon as possible. It was not missionary pressure but the Japanese themselves who took the initiative in giving it the more stringent form which it now has. Thus the greatest of all obstacles to a satisfactory marriage system, the double form of marriage with an interval during which the marriage is in an experimental stage, is done away with for our Christians.

The marriage canon is very incomplete, however, though we have been at work upon it for many years. We are all agreed that marriages of Christians with unbelievers are not to have any Christian blessing in Church, also that if a baptized Christian wishes to marry a Catechumen, such marriage is not permitted without the special sanction of the bishop given for exceptional reasons. (It must be remembered that Japanese marriage is, of course, a civil contract. No Christian body can either give or take away the status of husband or wife. What we can do is to prohibit the Church's blessing upon it, the use of the church and the services of the clergy, and to impose ecclesiastical discipline upon the offenders.) The question of prohibited degrees is the crux which for the present defers the completion of the canon, and the “Deceased Wife's Sister” is the crux of the crux. There is no abstract desire for or approval of any marriages to which we should take objection, and it is recognized that while Christians must not enter into alliances forbidden by the state, there is no reason why they should not abstain from alliances which the state does not forbid. But they see no sufficient reason for making a Church law out of line with the State law, under the influence of foreigners in whose own countries, though steeped in Christian tradition, law does not consistently forbid such unions. Under these circumstances, with the tide of popular opinion and of legislation rising on the subject of marriage, the bishops feel that it would be unwise to stereotype by the enactment of a canon anything below the highest standard which may hereafter become

attainable. They have, therefore, refused assent to any canon as yet proposed on this subject, though in all but one or two points satisfactory, and have dealt administratively with the very few cases which arise.

A Christian girl in a non-christian family has often very great difficulty in refusing a marriage with an unbeliever, for though legally no person can be either betrothed or married, or indeed divorced, without his or her own consent, yet betrothals which are regarded as binding are often made some years before marriage, and a girl of fifteen may have the whole weight of family pressure brought to bear to make her consent to a "suitable marriage" arranged for her. Hence the baptism of girls in the higher ranks is attended with great anxiety, and is often long delayed against their will.

Questions of the marriage of persons who have a former husband or wife living, are dealt with by the bishops according to the circumstances of the several cases. These vary immensely. We have nothing to do with what may have happened before the person became a Christian, and when she (or more rarely he) is divorced because of becoming a Christian, we have St. Paul's authority in favour of liberty, though we may advise patience and the effort to win over the unbelieving partner. But where it is a case of desertion, or where the divorce has been long delayed after one party became a Christian, there is more doubt. Theoretically the marriage, if legal, should stand; if social only it should be legalized, or the connexion broken off. Practically, however, the unbelieving partner may make this almost if not quite impossible. The bishop has, therefore, to consider all circumstances before giving a judgement.

I have written of things as we meet and deal with them among the Christians of our own communion. Other Christian bodies act differently, or in some cases appear to rest only on Christian public opinion, and to have no rule at all on these topics. Our rule and practice is, I think, influential for good beyond our own circle.

On the whole there is satisfactory progress in Japan generally, and our position, though not free from difficulty, is very stimulating and hopeful. Profound national changes of usage or of sentiment on such topics can hardly be the work of less than a generation. We shall do wisely to let the foreign hand be felt as little as possible, and while maintaining the highest standards in our life and teaching, to do what we can towards preventing lower ideals from being stereotyped by premature enactments. It must always be remembered that if

custom in regard to marriage is very lax in Japan, this is due less perhaps to looseness of moral fibre or mere self-indulgence than to ideas which in the West belong to the ancient world and have passed away with it ; and that at the present time Japan in these things is on the up-grade, while we, it is to be feared, are on the down. Nor is it a small matter that on this subject law, philosophy, and Christianity are independently working in the same direction. The issue is fraught with the gravest consequences ; but it lies with God. May we, Japanese Christians, and English and American Missionaries alike, be intelligent, efficient, and docile instruments in his Hand.

[Published for the Pan-Anglican Congress Committees, who alone are responsible for these Papers.]

SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE.

LONDON : NORTHUMBERLAND AVENUE, W.C.

1908.

PAN-ANGLICAN PAPERS

Being Problems for consideration at the *Pan-Anglican Congress*, 1908.

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS OF LICENCE AS TO MARRIAGE: ENGLAND

By THE REV. E. DAVIS, VICAR OF LOWMOOR, BRADFORD

LICENCE being unrestrained liberty of action, licence as to marriage is equivalent to free indulgence in acting contrary, or in opposition, to the restraints enjoined by marriage laws.

These restraints are Ecclesiastical and Civil. The Ecclesiastical operate for purposes of the Church ; the Civil for legal purposes of the State.

In England, before the year 1857, the ecclesiastical and the civil restraints were essentially identical. From that date certain ecclesiastical restraints have become inoperative for legal purposes of the State. What was licence before 1857 is not necessarily, from a civil point of view, licence now. But, from the point of view of the Church, all the ecclesiastical restraints are operative still ; and disobedience in regard to them is the measure of licence as to marriage, involving, in varying degrees, moral lawlessness, and the loss of Church privileges. Such licence is also fraught with very grave and far-reaching moral consequences.

But it is sometimes argued that the law of marriage which commands the universal obedience of mankind is not, of necessity, either the ecclesiastical law of the Church or the civil law of the State, but the Law of God : that the divine restraints of marriage are not always identical with the civil or ecclesiastical restraints : that, consequently action, within these divine restraints, is lawful, and ought not to be considered a bar to the enjoyment of spiritual privileges. This is true. And if to be married with a religious ceremony is the spiritual privilege sought, there is now no bar to the enjoyment of it. Recent legislation allows all persons, wishing to be married, to choose their own "appointed minister" and that "form of religious ceremony" which is agreeable to their view of the Law of God. A difficulty only arises when a claim is made by any guilty of ecclesiastical licence, to be married according to the Church's Form for the Solemnization of Holy Matrimony. This would itself be licence as to marriage, and as such cannot be allowed.

The subject, then, of the development of licence as to marriage, from a Church point of view, includes a consideration of the restraints of marriage enjoined by the English Church as Canon Law, and the grave consequences following the disregard of them. But one preliminary remark must be made. The ecclesiastical law of the Catholic Church is twofold. It embraces the Law of God, which is irrevocable, and ecclesiastical canons of discipline which are revocable by the authority which enjoined them. These from time to time have varied

—the law of the disabilities of the forbidden degrees is a case in point—the former, however, never. The indissolubility of marriage has always been enforced as the Law of God. But all the ecclesiastical canons in force in England in the twenty-fifth year of Henry VIII operate now. They form, together with later canons, the English Church Law. There is one difference. Disciplinary canons were formerly subjects of dispensation by proper canonical authority. Now, in England, the power of dispensing is very limited, and the Church is definitely precluded from exercising this power in the matter of the disabilities of the forbidden degrees. To do so constitutes “licence as to marriage”.

In considering the restraints of the ecclesiastical laws relating to marriage, it may be conveniently stated, generally, that the canons define the prerequisite conditions of marriage, the form of its solemnization, and the laws which are binding upon married persons. Licence is the contravention of any of these.

Of the prerequisite conditions, prenuptial chastity; capacity for the procreation of children; relationship, if any, outside the prohibited degrees; are of primary importance. It will be best to consider them in order.

The widespread prevalence of licence as to prenuptial chastity is only too evident to serious observers. The startling records of illegitimacy supply one grave indication.

In England and Wales during the year 1903, there were born out of wedlock 37,302 children, the total births for the year being 948,271. In 1905 the total births amounted to 929,293, of which 37,315 were born out of wedlock.

It is also interesting to compare the various districts. Thus in 1905 there were in the

1 London District	126,559	births	4,786	being illegitimate.
2 South-Eastern District . .	83,725	”	3,509	” “
3 South Midland District . .	60,150	”	2,267	” “
4 Eastern District	54,422	”	2,233	” “
5 South-Western District . .	44,884	”	1,809	” “
6 West Midland District . .	107,764	”	4,230	” “
7 North Midland District . .	59,774	”	2,822	” “
8 North-Western District . .	151,037	”	5,737	” “
9 Yorkshire District	102,003	”	4,673	” “
10 Northern District	72,060	”	2,784	” “
11 Welsh District	66,888	”	2,465	” “

From these figures it will be seen that unchastity productive of illegitimacy, whether prenuptial or not (that is, whether the persons marry afterwards or not) is pretty evenly distributed over every part of the country and that it is equally bad in all parts, one twenty-fifth of the children born being illegitimate.

But this is only one symptom of the awful and widespread practice of licence in the way of unchastity. Another is prenuptial unchastity, strictly so called. In many districts—in some probably more than in others—and certainly in the West Riding of Yorkshire, this form of

licence is very common indeed. Experience reveals the fact that it is terribly far-reaching and shamelessly practised. The development has many characteristics of its own. Loyalty is rarely absent, and there is generally apparent affection and devotion. Public marriage is looked upon as removing all irregularity and sealing the contract. And this is the common sentiment of great portions of the community. Moreover, one ruling principle confessedly is, that offspring may be assured. Clearly this form of licence is really secret marriage, and degrades wedlock from a holy estate, entered into and supported by the sanction of religion, to a civil contract outwardly graced by the form of a religious service, which only has a meaning in connexion with the solemnization of holy matrimony, at least according to the mind of the Church.

In considering the causes of the development of this licence several questions suggest themselves.

First, may there not be some connexion between this form of licence and the impossibility in England of a dissolution of marriage on the canonical ground of natural incapacity? It is possible that there may be a closer relation than at first sight appears.

Then, secondly, is not the suspension of ecclesiastical discipline in this, and in other respects, greatly responsible for the existence of such licence? Would not the restoration of discipline which, in cases of prenuptial unchastity, requires penitential reconciliation as a prior condition to the solemnization of holy matrimony, do more than anything else to check this licence?

Again, is not the Church often culpably responsible for some measure of this base development? In Yorkshire, at least, crowds, guilty of this licence, may be seen forsaking their own parish church and resorting to the old parish church of the town or city, where, in the crowd, they go through the form of marriage; thus acting contrary to the Church's law. Parochial discipline under such conditions is impossible, and the loss of it assists the development of licence.

There remains for consideration the impediments to marriage, which include forbidden relationships and any condition of life, in either party, which is contrary to the Church's law. Recent developments have to do with marriage with a deceased wife's sister and the marriage of divorced persons.

Non-lawful marriage being by the law of the Church indissoluble, divorced persons are subject to the disabilities prohibitive of marriage. Ecclesiastical divorce is that enforced by a disciplinary judicial sentence, which effectively separates parties lawfully married *à thoro et mensa*, on account of such transgressions as cruelty or adultery, but with a caution that they shall live chastely and continently. This excludes the re-marriage of either party, innocent or guilty, during the life of the other. The second form of divorce is that which follows a declaratory judicial sentence, declaring that, owing to some antecedent impediment, such as consanguinity or affinity, the marriage is void *ab initio*. Since, then, there was no lawful marriage, the parties may afterwards enter into the holy estate of matrimony. Churchmen,

as such, are subject to this law, and the suspension of the Church courts, in regard to causes matrimonial, does not affect them. It is the law of the Church and effective for spiritual purposes. Those who live contrary to this law, from a Church point of view, are guilty of licence. Since 1857 civil divorce has been granted by the civil courts dissolving the bond of matrimony, not only for antecedent disabilities prohibitive of marriage, but also for adultery, cruelty, and other transgressions; and the increasing frequency and grave results of this have become alarming. During the first ten years from 1857 there were 1,481 divorces decreed by the civil courts. During the next ten years the number amounted to 2,382. In the third decade 3,458 suits were successful, and the five following years saw 1,858 decrees dissolving marriage. Thus from 1857 to 1892, for which period figures are available, 9,179 couples, or 18,358 married persons, obtained from the State a dissolution of the bond of matrimony. And experience teaches that the increase noted is being maintained. Moreover, in this connexion, it must be remembered that petitions for divorce, which indicate very grave conditions of life, exceed by one-third the number successful. How many of these, from a Church point of view, are divorced agreeably to ecclesiastical law it is impossible to say. Probably they are very few. But one thing is certain: the transgressions of the Church's law by divorced persons not living "chastely or continently", to use the words of the canon, but "re-marrying", from the point of view of the State, are of increasingly grave concern. The growing extent of this licence as to marriage is partly revealed by the registers of marriage, in which those previously divorced are described as such. These were from 1861 to 1867, 188. During the next decade they were 604: in the decade following they numbered 1,322: in the next five years they were 883: in the three years 1900-2 they amounted to 1,285: in the next three years to 1,657. These figures speak for themselves. And when it is considered what divorce means, in all the accompanying circumstances, the matter would seem to become a material concern. As affecting the Church, however, the case is clear. Persons suffering such grave disabilities cannot be admitted, by the Church, into the holy estate of matrimony; nor be thought of as capable of receiving Church privileges, so long as they continue to transgress the Church's law.

Marriage with a deceased wife's sister is another matter of concern. The Act of Parliament recently passed has made this possible as a civil contract. But the Act leaves the ecclesiastical law effective for Church purposes. No person within the Church's prohibited degrees may claim the right of being married in the face of the Church. The clergy are even specially prevented from entering into the civil contract, which the Act allows to all others.

It is too soon to form any opinion as to the future consequences of this new legislation, but inquiries would seem to show that, at present, the proportion of persons desiring to enter into such unions is about two in one thousand of the population. With the liberty now allowed there will probably be a gradual development of this licence as to marriage, but the duty of the Church clearly lies in strict obedience

to ecclesiastical law, and in refusing to allow a man to marry his deceased wife's sister, through the instrumentality of the ministry, and also in maintaining that such marriages are, from an ecclesiastical point of view, null and void.

The law of the Church concerning the Form of the Solemnization of Holy Matrimony must now be considered. What is licence will then be evident.

The ecclesiastical laws regulating the solemnization of matrimony require that the ceremony shall take place after the publication of banns, or the production of a licence issued by the Church authority. The State law allows a parish priest to accept a superintendent registrar's certificate in lieu of banns. Moreover, the banns must be published in the church of the parish wherein the persons to be married dwell, or if they live in divers parishes they must be asked in both. The law provides for publicity to ensure the absence of impediments as to the legality of the marriage.

In populous centres there is much licence existing in this matter. Banns of marriage are asked, and persons are married, in many old parish churches which are not the churches of the ecclesiastical parish in which the contracting parties dwell. Publicity is avoided. Licence as to marriage, in the way of prenuptial unchastity, and the repudiation of the prohibitive degrees, is practically encouraged. The power of the parish priest, in the administration of his cure, is seriously weakened. All conception of the sanctity of marriage is in many parts almost completely lost.

The development of the tendency to consider marriage rather as a civil contract than a holy estate may be measured by information supplied in official returns. Previously to the year 1836 all marriages in England, excepting those of Jews and Quakers, were required to be solemnized according to the rites and ceremonies of the Church of England. Since that year it has been possible, for those who wish it, to be married, from a State point of view, before the district registrar; and more lately before an appointed person in a chapel. In 1903 261,103 marriages were registered. Of these, 170,044 were married according to the rites and ceremonies of the Church of England; 44,520 before the district registrar in his office; 26,538 before the registrar in denominational chapels; 7,380 before an appointed minister in chapels; 10,621 were Roman Catholic marriages;—in the latter case the civil marriage took place first before the registrar, in the vestry, and the religious ceremony followed. Of Quakers there were 106 marriages, and of Jews 1,894. In the year 1905 the numbers were: total marriages 260,742; Church of England 165,747; before the registrar in his office, 47,768; before the registrar in chapels, 26,097; before the appointed minister in chapels, 8,258; Roman Catholic marriages, 10,812; Quakers, 80; Jews, 1,980. Thus the purely secular marriages are steadily increasing, and the idea of the sanctity of marriage is proportionately decreasing. The existence of these facts seems to be a very definite call to the Church, to consider whether licence in her practice as to the publication of banns, and the solemnization of mar-

riages in churches other than the proper parish churches of the persons concerned, has not had much to do with the development of this idea. For the removal of publicity makes licence easy, and licence is destructive of sanctity. To make use of the State's permission to accept the registrar's certificate is a less evil; for this makes it possible for the parish priest to learn the condition of the contracting party before solemnizing the marriage.

One other development connected with a matter closely touching the solemnization of holy matrimony must be noticed. In the year 1857 the jurisdiction of the ecclesiastical courts was suspended in causes matrimonial in everything, except in the authority to issue licences for marriage. These licences were the Church's licences, and were limited in their terms and operation by the law of the Church. Since then, some chancellors have issued these licenses under the authority of the Church courts, but according to the provisions of the civil law. They have allowed the marriage of persons divorced for adultery! This is "licence as to marriage" indeed! And, as to the effects, it breeds shameless licence. For so long as the Church seems to sanction the breaking of her own laws by her own officials, it cannot but result that licence will increase, and in this case such licence!—the licence of adultery and all the debasing horrors attending it. Here is one of the gravest of questions crying out for immediate solution.

There is one other element deserving attention. The solemnization of marriage according to the Church's intention ought to be connected with a celebration of Holy Communion. Christ's presence sanctifies the union of His members in proportion as they approach Him worthily. The sanctity of marriage flows from this. It is therefore a matter for consideration whether, with a view to the restoration of this truth in the minds of churchmen, it is not advisable to separate the civil contract from the religious ceremony in marriage, and to reserve the latter for those who obey the Church's law. A sure method of restraining licence is to refuse to apparently clothe it with religious sanctity.

A further question relates to the development of licence as to marriage during the married state. This was ordained to ensure continency; the discipline of family life; and the procreation and religious education of children.

Licence here takes the form of the married not living continently, nor cleaving to one another, but, with growing frequency, attaching themselves to others; impelled by likes and dislikes, by lust, by resentment against discipline, by indulging a depraved appetite for unrestrained personal liberty. The revelations of the Divorce Court are the symptoms of this licence, which tends to the destruction of family life, and treats marriage as a matter of mere convenience and self-indulgence.

The serious proportionate decrease in the birth-rate in England points to another form of licence in married persons. There is a growing tendency to look upon offspring only from the point of view of utility, and as a hindrance to ease and comfort. Where wage-earners are desired there is licence in one direction; where they are not there

is licence in another. The checking of the increase of population is from every point of view a grave moral, social, political, and religious question, urgently demanding serious attention.

It may be helpful to consider facts relating to one large city and to England and Wales.

	Mean birth-rate per 1,000 of population.			
	1881	1891	1901	1906
City of Bradford . . .	33.0	27.7	23.0	20.6

This reveals a decrease in the birth-rate of 38 per cent. since 1881.

England and Wales . .	34.0	30.7	28.6	27.0
-----------------------	------	------	------	------

	Birth-rate per 1,000 women aged 15-45.			
	1880-2	1890-2	1900-2	1906
City of Bradford . . .	129.1	105.3	83.8	75.5
England and Wales . .	147.7	129.7	114.8	?

This table shows that the true decrease is greater than that indicated above. The facts speak for themselves.

It remains to look at licence as to marriage from the point of view of the State, and the duty of the Church regarding it.

The State, which treats marriage as a civil contract, takes no cognizance of the moral condition of the parties before marriage; allows persons divorced by its own court to marry again; permits a man to marry his deceased wife's sister. Ecclesiastical licence in these matters is of no account to the State. But the State nowhere pretends to assert that this licence shall not be reckoned as such, for spiritual purposes. Only in one particular does the State compel a clergyman to break Church law by lending his church for the marriage of divorced persons, and, in another, protects him from censure if he performs the ceremony himself. But this latter does not compel him to break the Church's law. And in every other particular the administrative power of the Church is practically confirmed. Licence as to marriage remains, ecclesiastically, licence, and subject to ecclesiastical censures. Those who administer Church affairs are nowhere relieved of their obligation to administer them according to Church law.

A question requiring notice is concerned with licence as to marriage, when repudiating all law. There are ugly signs of a development of illicit marriages, wanting even the civil contract, and that among very young people. And with this are connected many grave evils. The birth-rate of illegitimate children, indeed, shows a decrease. Per 1,000 of unmarried or widowed women, aged 15 to 40, it was :

	1880-2	1890-2	1900-2	1906
City of Bradford . . .	17.6	9.2	7.1	5.9
England and Wales . .	14.1	10.5	8.5	?

But this proves nothing. Such might be expected from the general decrease in the birth-rate. Under the circumstances, however, the fact tends to confirm the truth of the suspicion regarding the immoral

cause of that decrease. This licence, in the married state, or out of it, thrives upon the knowledge acquired, through which the decrease comes about. The growth of knowledge has assisted the development of sin.

And another criminal licence as to marriage, repudiating all law, must not be omitted. Incest in England is not punishable as an offence, but it is said to be one of the causes of the physical deterioration of the lower classes of the larger towns and cities of the country. Such is a further heinous form of licence, sinful, beyond measure immoral, yet widespread and terribly grave in its consequences !

What, then, is the Church's duty ?

Licence as to marriage in all its most depraved and debasing forms cannot be touched by municipal or parliamentary enactments. Education, without religion, advances it. Only the ministrations of the Church can really reach it. Penitential discipline alone is able to effect a cure. Figures have been quoted with reference to the City of Bradford which illustrate this. Bradford justly boasts of its commercial and educational progress. During the fifty years previous to 1881, the population of this great industrial centre increased, with its increasing prosperity, by leaps and bounds. A small town became an enormous city. Since 1881, in less prosperous but more luxurious days, the birth-rate has seriously and suggestively declined. "The fall in the Bradford birth-rate has been greater than in the rest of England." Here, where education is almost idolized ; where the Church is numerically weak ; where there are only 92 clergy to minister to 400,000 souls ; where the penitential discipline of the Church is a negligible quantity : here the birth-rate points to ugly licence as to marriage, a prenuptial unchastity is viewed commercially. Is not this a matter for reflection ?

Licence develops when the restraining influence of the Church is weak. May it not be the fact that past neglect to recognize this, and the truth of the converse, has been gravely responsible for recent developments of licence as to marriage, and that the true method of reform lies in the gentle application of ecclesiastical discipline ? But does not this suggest another question ?

Is not the greatest want of the Church in England to-day : a school of moral and ascetical theology, and the devotion of the priesthood to the study and courageous teaching of its principles ? Without this, ecclesiastical discipline must be ineffective. Through this divine science, and its disciplinary use, the grave moral problems of the age will find their solution.

[Published for the Pan-Anglican Congress Committees, who alone are responsible for these Papers.]

SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE.

LONDON : NORTHUMBERLAND AVENUE, W.C.

1908.

PAN-ANGLICAN PAPERS

Being Problems for consideration at the *Pan-Anglican Congress*, 1908.

GAMBLING AMONGST MEN

BY THE REV. PAUL B. BULL

Community of the Resurrection, Mirfield.

BEFORE attempting to analyze the gambling spirit and to suggest some methods by which it can be restrained, it is necessary to point out that the terrible evil, which is swiftly destroying the very foundations of character in our race, is deep-rooted in our social and economic system. It is profoundly unjust and dishonest to condemn the street arab for trying to double his income by risking it at "pitch and toss" while men honour the millionaire who often doubles his income by far more questionable means. We must try to find a principle which will apply to all alike in condemning this vice. As long as Society is organized on the basis that an individualistic interpretation of self-love is the only reliable instinct in human nature, it seems impossible to condemn the gambling spirit which is the inevitable fruit which must spring from this root. In the present organization of Society we note two fatal divorcements.

(1) The possession of money has become divorced from labour.

(2) The people have been divorced from the land.

1. All serious and honest efforts to deal with the evil of gambling must be based on a real desire to found Society on a rational basis, instead of the present basis which includes such a large element of chance. This element of chance cannot be eliminated altogether from human affairs, because of the imperfections of our knowledge. But the condemnation of Gambling rests entirely on the belief that man is a rational being whose duty it is to enlarge the circle of his rational control over the forces of Nature, and to bring them ever more and more under the control of a righteous will. This duty cannot be enforced so long as we acquiesce in an organization of Society which allows the things that men desire to be distributed largely by chance. Our first effort in striking at the gambling spirit must be to work towards a state of Society in which wealth (i. e. well-being) will be distributed on some rational principle as nearly as possible in proportion to man's effort to contribute to the common wealth. Money must be brought back to its original use—as a medium of exchange and as a means of distributing the reward of effort. As long as money can command those things which man desires—security against want, comfort, leisure, opportunity of self-development and self-expression, influence, power—and as long as it is distributed largely by Chance, so long is the spirit

of gambling deep-rooted in the basis of society. Every effort must be made to change the formula that "Money breeds money" into the formula that "Labour breeds money". This alone will kill the gambling spirit at its root by inspiring the hope of rational reward of effort, and by as far as possible eliminating the appeal to chance.

2. The divorcement of the people from the land so that we have become "a nation of nomads" strengthens the gambling spirit by increasing the love of money from fear of want. The landless man has no security for himself or family, and is driven to seek the most swift way to accumulate money, which can give him some security for himself and those he loves. The right to the use of land would to some extent give him a basis of security for primal wants, and diminish the power of the love of money.

It has been necessary to face these fundamental questions of the organization of Society in order that we may be honest and truthful in our condemnation of the gambling spirit. It is useless to tell the gambler that it is wrong to desire to get money without working for it when the possession of an unearned income is the one ambition of the upper classes and, in the popular estimation, the distinguishing mark of a "gentleman".

I. WHAT IS GAMBLING?

1. *Commerce and Stock Exchange.* We must put aside the large operations on the Stock Exchange and in commerce, which are to be dealt with in another paper. It is sufficient here to say that in both these spheres of activity it is possible to distinguish a legitimate and an illegitimate transaction. In the highly developed state of Society in which the differentiation of function has been carried far, it is necessary to have some persons who can superintend the transference of capital from one enterprise to another and from one person to another. This is the legitimate work of the Stock Exchange. Again, it is necessary to have men of judgement, experience, foresight, and boldness to direct the forces of human intelligence in winning the control over nature, and in supplying the needs of large populations. In both these works of experiment and commerce we must allow and even encourage the taking of risks, the staking of a certainty upon an uncertainty, the willingness to risk a present possession in the hope of a future gain.

The speculations of experimentalists and men of commerce are distinguished from gambling by these marks:—

(1) They employ the highest activities of a man's judgement and reason, and thus develop instead of destroying character.

(2) They benefit the community as well as the individual by extending man's control over nature or by supplying his wants.

(3) The enterprise is an act of faith in a rational ordered universe, and not an appeal to chance. They spare no pains to eliminate the element of chance: while the fascination of gambling depends on exactly the opposite process—the elimination of the element of reason.

2. *A Definition of Gambling.* Bishop Westcott defined gambling as "the habitual seeking of personal gain through another's loss, though with his consent, without making any adequate return for what they received, or adding anything to the sum of their common wealth". Others define it thus:—"The determination of the ownership of property by appeal to chance. By chance is here implied the resultant of the play of natural forces that cannot be controlled or calculated by those who appeal to it." The Ethics of Gambling is discussed in a thoughtful essay by Mr. Hobson in *Betting and Gambling* by R. S. Rowntree (Macmillan & Co., 5s. 6d. edition).

Gambling is either "pure" or "mixed". "Pure gambling" is that in which all element of skill and judgement is eliminated and the appeal is to chance alone. "Mixed gambling" is that in which the determining power of chance is qualified to some degree by skill.

II. THE SPIRIT OF GAMBLING.

Since the spirit of gambling has made its appearance in almost every age and in every land, it is necessary to seek for its roots in the constitution of human nature. The Instincts which lie at the root of the gambling spirit are not wholly bad. It is the wrong way of satisfying them which makes gambling wrong. These instincts may be classified thus:

1. *Instinct of Conquest.* Man has a divine instinct and a divine commission to pit himself against the forces of the rest of nature and "to subdue them", "to have dominion over them." He cannot assert himself in such a way as to win control unless he is willing to accept some risk. The spirit of adventure is essential to progress.

2. *A Right Self-Assertion* may be traced in love of adventure which leads men to pit themselves against the Unknown. This accounts for the fact that young men are eager to endure hardship, to suffer, and to risk their lives in sport, the conquest of the animal creation, and in discovery, the conquest of the inanimate creation. This is legitimate because the destruction of dangerous animals and the training of others enlarges human capacity and enriches life, and discovery enlarges the regions of rational control as against chance.

3. *The Love of Excitement.* Rational certainty is dull. Mechanical toil deadens the emotional life. Man rightly refuses to become a machine, and demands room for the free movement of his emotional life. If this right desire is denied healthy realization, as it is in overwork at school, in offices, and especially in mills and factories where men direct machinery, it will drive men to gambling as the quickest way by which to revive the emotional life.

4. *The Love of Freedom.* Laws, regulations, rules, at times make the best of men fretful. They are the necessary discipline of a fallen race, but they are meant to train men for freedom from law when they freely choose God's will. The strict discipline of soldiers and sailors, while it is just and righteous and good, leads to strong reactions when

they are free to express themselves. So with most men the unexpected and accidental adds interest to life.

5. *The Love of Money.* Many right motives lead man to love money, because money can procure many things that men rightly desire. Money procures security against want for self and others, freedom from anxiety as to primal needs, comfort, leisure, education, power to express oneself and to realize many projects of the mind, influence, the opportunity of controlling other lives.

These ambitions are not wrong in themselves. It depends on whether they are directed to selfish ends or to the fulfilment of God's purpose. But, when the most laborious men see that money is often accumulated without effort by chance, the temptation to seek a short and easy way to wealth is very strong.

III. THE PSYCHOLOGICAL EFFECT OF GAMBLING.

Before we can answer the questions "Is gambling wrong?" and "Why is gambling wrong?" we must examine its effect on the Individual and on Society. If it can be shown to be harmful to the mental and moral life of the Individual and to the well-being of Society, then it is stamped as sinful.

1. *Effect on the Individual.* In pure gambling a man deliberately lays aside the use of all those faculties which mark personality—his conscience, reason, will, affection. He deliberately reduces himself to a being who has only passion and emotions. And as he stands aside, helpless to affect the issue, his passions and emotions have full play. As he watches the spinning wheel or the fall of the cards he no longer has to *think*, only to *feel*. Hope rises to its highest pitch of exaltation; then in a moment plunges into despair. Greed and desire are fed by every win, and wounded by every loss. Fear and expectation and anxiety stretch the soul almost to the breaking-point, and then in a flash yield to a joy which intoxicates the soul, or to a despair which paralyses it. Other sins work up by a long process to a crisis of passion. The gambler has a crisis every minute. As the lower passions and emotions are thus every moment inflamed they literally kill out the finer and nobler passions. It literally dehumanizes a man. In a recent crisis at Wall Street, the American Stock Exchange has been described as a picture of hell; each man in selfish isolation, indifferent to the loss of others, inflamed by excitement, almost delirious with fear, mad with greed, selfish, callous, cruel, a man reduced to a wolf, "but a wolf with a human brain."

Canon Horsley, the famous prison chaplain, gives the result of his immense experience in dealing with criminals:—

"The men habitually on the Turf seemed to be the *very incarnation* of cunning and suspicion and selfishness."

"No class of criminals that came under my notice while Chaplain of Clerkenwell House of Detention were so *utterly selfish*, so *callously brutal*, and so incapable of believing in the existence of truth and honesty in others, as those who had been on the Turf."

2. *Its effect on Society.* If men are to live together in Society it can only be by suppressing certain anti-social instincts and by cultivating certain social virtues.

Gambling is anti-social and even threatens the very disintegration of Society, because :—

- (1) It seeks to gain by another's loss.
- (2) It adds nothing to the common wealth.
- (3) It destroys the spirit of brotherhood by emphasizing selfishness.
- (4) It inflames the lower passions and emotions.
- (5) It destroys the spirit of industry.
- (6) It destroys reverence for persevering labour.
- (7) It is invariably accompanied after a certain point by lying, cheating, stealing, bribery, fraud, and every form of dishonesty.
- (8) It ranks, with drink, as the chief cause, direct and indirect, of crime. It is the direct cause in many cases of cheating, loading dice, selling races and athletic matches, dopping horses, &c., &c. It is the indirect cause of crime in leading to very frequent embezzlement, forgery, bankruptcy, debt, and suicide.
- (9) By its effect on the individual character it unfits him for social service; e.g., by absorbing the interest of railway and signalmen it imperils the lives which are depending on their watchfulness, as in the North British Railway collision at Lockmill siding.

(10) It kills true sport.

The evil has now attained to such vast proportions that it is scarcely necessary to describe it in detail. Every class in the nation is infected with this disease. Bookmakers try to establish agents in every factory and workshop. They bet not only with men but also with women and children. They haunt the homes of the working-man when he is away at work, and ensnare the wives into betting transactions which often involve their home in ruin.

The National Anti-Gambling League says that the wage earners of this country risked every year £5,000,000 in betting and gambling, while in 5½ years there were 80 suicides, 321 embezzlements, and 191 bankruptcies traceable to betting.

The anti-social nature of betting and gambling is manifest when we realize that if the whole fraternity of speculators on the Stock Exchange, the unemployed among the rich, bookmakers, all who manage lotteries and gambling concerns, and the vast number of those whom they employ—if all this sordid class of men were swept away to-morrow, the wealth of the world would not be diminished in any department, moral, spiritual, intellectual, or physical; true sport would revive, and a fountain of vice and crime would be sealed up. The fact is that they, with the mere devotees of pleasure among the rich, are worthless and dangerous parasites who live on the labours of others and imperil the life of Society. From this condemnation we must carefully exclude those among the rich who voluntarily devote their lives to some occupation which is socially useful, such as *good* landlords, artists, men of science, and *some* members of Parliament.

V. WHY IS BETTING AND GAMBLING WRONG?

The practice of betting and gambling may be exposed as wrong on the following grounds. Gambling is wrong in itself:—

1. Because it seeks personal gain through another's loss without making any adequate return.

2. Because it is not socially useful, it adds nothing to the common wealth (i. e. well-being). It is difficult to get Englishmen to see this point as marking the practice as wrong, because an exaggerated individualism is rapidly destroying the sentiments of citizenship and patriotism, and an idolatry of Liberty makes men refuse to restrain selfishness.

3. Because it is socially and individually very harmful after a certain point, by destroying the foundations of good character. It seems possible to classify the practice of betting and gambling with the practice of taking dangerous stimulants and drugs. This is probably the strongest ground from which to persuade persons to oppose them, as the higher considerations drawn from the sense of social duty and responsibility do not deeply move the consciences of men who are accustomed to a debased view of property and wealth, and who see nothing wrong but something to be much desired in the irresponsible use of unearned increment.

The analogy between gambling and the taking of dangerous stimulants and drugs is close. Each gives pleasure by exalting and enlarging the emotional life while it paralyses the higher faculties. Each is followed by a reaction which demands a repeated indulgence. Each imperils the life by creating a desire which rapidly becomes a craving; each paralyses the will by a terrible fascination. It is difficult to prove that either of them is wrong in itself, while it is easy to show that both are wrong because they imperil the life. It is in both cases easy to appeal to right-minded persons not to indulge in a practice which, while it may do no injury to the strong-minded, may ruin others by the force of example.

4. Because it determines the ownership of property by an appeal to Chance. The appeal to chance is wrong for a rational being until he has exhausted every possible use of his judgement and reason.

5. "Betting and gambling stand in exactly the same relation to stealing as duelling does to murder. In both cases the consent of the victim and the chance of being the successful criminal does not alter the moral character of the act." (Hugh Price Hughes.)

VI. WHAT CAN BE DONE?

1. *Social Remedies.* Some reference has already been made to these, so that here it will be sufficient to summarize them. Every effort at healthy social reform will diminish the gambling spirit. The attempt to bring the possession of money into closer connexion with, and fairer proportion to, effort and labour and social utility, to reduce to a minimum unearned increment, to teach a higher ideal of duty and responsibility for wealth and leisure and to brand idleness as a degrading

sin among the rich as well as among the poor, will make men more careful in the use of money. But social reform cannot cure this evil. Betting and gambling are the vices of prosperity, not of adversity. Not only the monotony of mechanical toil, but also the ennui of a brainless life which is bankrupt of thoughts drives men to gambling. By social and legislative reform we may reduce temptations to a minimum, but the root of the vice is in the selfish heart, and we must attack it there.

2. *Church Teaching.* At present the Clergy are too often the Apologists of Self-indulgence instead of the Apostles of Self-sacrifice in this matter, trying to find excuses for indulging in the practice instead of motives for abandoning it. Church teaching should emphasize the following points:—

(1) *The Duty of Labour.* Clergy are right in claiming Catholic liberty of enjoyment as opposed to Puritan condemnation and restrictions, for all creation has been purified by the Incarnation and summed up in Christ, and re-creation is a duty. But a Christian's life-purpose is to witness for Christ and thus help to redeem the world, and his pleasures and relaxations must be subordinated to this end. This makes it wrong for him to indulge in any amusements which injure personality and become socially harmful. It also forbids Idleness and seeking Pleasure as an end in itself.

(2) *The Duty of Example.* The Christian life is positive not negative. It is essentially a life of witness. It is not Christian so long as it seeks merely to avoid what is wrong. It is only Christian when it aims at what is highest and best. It is obvious that when any practice, even if it is not sinful in itself, has reached such a point that it has become one of the chief causes of crime and is bringing ruin to innumerable souls, and is the destruction of our social life, as betting and gambling have become, no Christian ought to touch even the beginning of it. Rom. xiv, 21.

(3) *Responsibility for the Use of Talents,* such as time and money. This point has been already dealt with. It cannot be too often urged that as a Christian is only a trustee of his possessions he must use his life and goods for the well-being of all.

3. *Organization.* The vice of betting and gambling is especially hard to combat on two accounts, (i) it is not outwardly repulsive, as is drunkenness, (ii) like the Drink Interest it is propagated and defended by men in high position and by a vast wealthy and highly organized army of the most sordid and unscrupulous men in the land. It has been estimated that there are 20,000 bookmakers who turn over £50,000,000 a year. To these add the vast horde of tipsters, sporting prophets, newsagents, who live by spreading this vice, and it will be seen what a vast interest we have to combat. An occasional sermon cannot counteract such an influence. The Church must organize itself in every parish as it has in many cases against the Drink Curse. The National Anti-Gambling League, 13 Victoria St., Westminster, London, S.W., has done splendid work in exposing the vice and informing public opinion, and deserves universal support.

Bishops should absolutely forbid raffles and lotteries at Church Bazaars as they are immoral and illegal.

4. *Legislation.* We have dealt first with the formation of public opinion as legislation cannot rightly precede the demand for it. But the nation is probably ripe now for the following Legislative Reforms which are recommended in an admirable essay by Mr. John Hawke in Rowntree's *Betting and Gambling* :—

(1) *Repression of Gambling in the Stock, &c.* “To ensure this no contract should be made enforceable or legal unless made upon Government stamped paper. The real buyer of £500 would not complain of having to pay 2s. or say 1s. per £100 to the National Exchequer; but the dealers in a £2,000,000 gambling contract would think twice before incurring a first definite outlay of £2,000 or even £1,000 cash down. A similar regulation would be desirable for the Produce, &c., Exchanges.”

(2) *Press Competitions and Coupon Gambling.* “Make illegal all such competitions in which there is a material element of chance.”

“Make it illegal for any publication to offer in any one edition a prize or prizes of the aggregate value of more than £5 for any purpose whatever.”

(3) *Purification of the Press.* The prohibition of the publication of betting odds would kill nine-tenths of betting at one stroke; it is a step which would be welcomed by the best class of newspapers. It is violently opposed by the bookmakers, whose victims it would save.

CONCLUSION.

Are Englishmen still open to an appeal to their patriotism? In Japan, at one word from the Mikado, all the feudal nobles surrendered their lands and rights and privileges because it was for the good of the nation.

If one man in England would refuse to attend any races where there was betting, and if the rich by a self-denying ordinance would entirely suppress playing cards for money, they would strike a great blow at England's greatest enemy and partly regain their influence with the people.

But when all has been said and done by social and legislative effort to diminish temptations, we must come back to the central point and only adequate cure—a true conversion. Gambling is rooted in selfishness. It can only be uprooted by teaching self-sacrifice. It is useless merely to restrain without converting, for Selfishness which is denied expression in one direction will find it in another. It is into the vacant heart and empty head that the seven devils enter, and the only power to expel them from the heart of a man or a Nation is the love of Jesus which destroys the wrong self-love and fills the life with joy.

[Published for the Pan-Anglican Congress Committees, who alone are responsible for these Papers.]

PAN-ANGLICAN PAPERS

Being Problems for consideration at the *Pan-Anglican Congress*, 1908.

BETTING AND GAMBLING AMONG WORKING WOMEN AND GIRLS

By AUGUSTA DEANE

A CRAVING for excitement, together with the chance of gaining money they have not earned, causes a large number of women and girls of the working class to gamble. That this vice has grown among them in the last few years, and is a very serious evil in our midst, is proved by evidence coming from all parts of England in answer to careful inquiry.

In different places different forms of betting and gambling prevail. The most usual form in the North Country districts would seem to be "putting something on a horse". In the Midlands there is also much betting on the results of football matches; this, too, is not unknown in some of the bigger West Country towns. A very popular form of betting is the Sweepstake, and perhaps the most pernicious the Lottery or Raffle.

Money Clubs exist in many places, kept, as a rule, by a woman, who is paid something a week to manage it, and then once a fortnight or once a month there is a great "drawing", and the prize winner gets a fixed sum—perhaps £1—and the manager of the club keeps what is over. It is evident that they bet on the results of games of dominoes, and also on wrestling and walking matches when the contending parties are well-known local men. Cards are almost unknown amongst factory and mill hands, but among shop assistants and domestic servants "playing cards for points" at their clubs and "below stairs" is the most common form of gambling, and in big houses where there are stables it is often found that the maids are tempted by the outdoor servants to bet on a hunt steeplechase, or on a favourite horse.

It has been proved that often the women who go from door to door selling things give betting papers to, or receive them from, maid-servants. Shops in some big towns have been discovered issuing what are practically "raffle" tickets, through girls they employ, people paying so much with the chance of getting a blanket or something of that sort if their ticket turns out "a lucky number".

Though betting and gambling amongst women is common in some districts, it is almost unknown in others. It is impossible to give much of the evidence which has come to hand. Amongst the Lanca-

shire cotton girls a great deal of ordinary betting is carried on by women "bookies", who are often outwardly respectable working women, who mix with the girls when they come out in the dinner-hour, and to whom it has been noticed the girls hand papers.

In some of the Durham towns the men who encourage the "pitmen's" wives to bet are connected with drapery and furnishing shops, the inducement being that they will be able to get better clothes for their children than the father's wages would run to, and they are often helped to pay their betting debts by pawning blankets, &c., given them in trust for that purpose.

In a Liverpool workhouse a woman lamented they did not have the sort of gambling clubs up there she had frequented in London. One worker, who writes from Liverpool, says that at a certain place between the hours of 12 and 1 a detective watched a suspected house, and between forty and fifty women and children entered for betting purposes.

From Birmingham another writes: "Many women I know often stripped their houses to put money on horses, and several streets in our neighbourhood were known as betting quarters. 'Bookies' used to stand in the open street on Monday mornings, and I have frequently seen women and children hand papers to them."

Another writes: "I know as a fact that girls and women in some of the large factories in the city are themselves employed by bookmakers. Of course, I came across many very sad cases of bailiffs in the house for rent, &c., for which the husband had given the wife the money."

The police seem to be very strict about the *big* bookmakers, but they have often been known not to trouble about the small ones, because they cannot pay the fines.

One writes from the North: "I have known women sell the shoes and stockings from off the children's feet to get coppers to put on their favourite horse."

A betting-place in Sunderland was watched, and of the people who went in two-thirds were women and girls.

The rush in many big towns for the sporting papers shows that the women and girls have interests at stake—they are seen reading them after a race at the street corners. At Wolverhampton several women bookmakers have been fined.

"Children are being taught in many places to gamble; they have been known to cheat their parents out of halfpennies by getting cheaper articles than those they were sent to buy, so as to have the odd halfpence for betting with."

From Stafford comes the following: "The gambling amongst factory girls spreads; they do it because there are women bookmakers."

In the East End of London men have been known to drive slowly in a dogcart, and, if no policeman is in sight, they pull up and take money and papers from men and women who have collected them from factory hands in the dinner-hour.

In Manchester, it is said by one who has gone into the subject carefully, that "Betting is made very easy to women in their own street and in their own homes".

Not very long ago a bookmaker was fined for receiving 2*d.* bets on the Derby from children!

In Bristol, in a very poor district, a certain greengrocer's shop kept by a woman, issued betting papers, which were often carefully enclosed in the parcels of fruit and vegetables.

The National Anti-Gambling League gives some startling evidence of recent cases amongst women and children. This instance is typical of several others:

"A street bookmaker was recently seen to take forty bets from women in ten minutes, some of the women paying him three visits in that short time. The bookmakers go from door to door to induce working-class women to bet during the absence at work of their husbands. They often risk money given them for household purposes."

"At Woolwich a betting-house had been entered by 150 persons in the week, none of them staying more than half a minute; most of them were children between 7 and 14, and half the rest were women."

"A married woman was fined £10 at the Thames Police Court for bookmaking. Another was fined for keeping a betting-house in Manchester, and another for street betting at Walworth."

About the large mills at Wigan women and girls have been known to give slips of paper to respectably dressed women who mingle with them, bearing the name of the favourite football team they wish to back the following day.

A worker of large experience in Nottingham says that betting and gambling is on the increase amongst women and girls.

"As far as factories and workshops are concerned," one who has been a lady factory inspector says, "she has found that, when the factory and workshop law was carefully administered things would be all right, but when employers are careless about them and when places are badly conducted, she had found foremen themselves becoming bookies and arranging gambling among the girls." This, of course, is very interesting, because it works into the general question of industrial laws, and points to the fact that careful administration prevents other evils indirectly, as well as those at which it is really aimed.

From different parts of London come widely different reports. From Battersea a worker writes: "It is a growing evil and we see much of it."

From the Isle of Dogs another writes: "I have worked nineteen years in the Isle of Dogs and three or four years in Whitechapel, but have never to my knowledge known a girl who had money on horses and gambled in other ways."

Writing from Bristol another says, "I have worked for many years amongst all sorts of factory girls, and have not known a single instance of gambling amongst them."

A Lancashire worker says, "They would not do it but for the men and women touts who frequent the streets near the mills in the morning and evening and at the dinner-hour."

Not long ago a lady noticed with concern that two of her servants were very miserable and in trouble. On asking the cause, she found

they had lost every penny they possessed through "backing the wrong horse in the Derby".

"What can I do to prevent the servants playing cards for money?" somebody asked at a recent Social Conference. "Example in the drawing-room is the only way," was the answer.

As long as Bridge-playing for money takes place in the drawing-room, the same will most likely occur below stairs.

Where horse-racing and betting are the order of the day, those in the stables will tempt those in the house, and gambling amongst this particular class of working women and girls is as a rule simply a desire to do the fashionable thing.

One worker amongst women in Bury writes: "It is mostly unintelligent betting. They bet about things they know nothing about, just for excitement and for getting some money without working for it. It all comes from want of 'stuff' in their heads to think about and 'things' to talk about. Their education has given them no interest in Literature and Art; they can only talk about their friends and their enemies and other neighbours, their work is monotonous. There is mind and brain and nothing to satisfy it—nothing to interest it. Religion, with its stories and the trains of thought which it engenders, and the social interests which come from Sunday School and trips and picnics, are their only salvation. The only girls who don't bet are the religious ones."

It is seen, then, that this great evil exists—indeed, is increasing amongst the working women and girls of to-day. A realization of this evil may be arrived at after investigating the ample evidence from all parts of our country.

The educating of public opinion may do much—religion can do more. If so, the *Church* must lead the way. No more "raffles" at bazaars; no questionable system of "rewards" in clubs. Individual Church-women must by pure and true example help their weaker sisters. It is so often the love of excitement which causes it, growing out of dissatisfaction with their lives as they are. In the things of God "chance" cannot enter, and the only life that *satisfies* is the life that is Christ-like.

[Published for the Pan-Anglican Congress Committees, who alone are responsible for these Papers.]

SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE.

LONDON: NORTHUMBERLAND AVENUE, W.C.

1908.

PAN-ANGLICAN PAPERS

Being Problems for consideration at the *Pan-Anglican Congress*, 1908.SOME PRESENT ASPECTS OF THE
TEMPERANCE PROBLEM IN
ENGLAND

By H. J. TORR, Esq.

THE Temperance Problem is of two kinds—the personal and the legislative. Of these there is no doubt that the personal problem is the more important, but because it deals only with the individual and has no place in the political platform or the columns of the daily press it attracts far less attention than the other. Nevertheless, it remains true that the only permanent solution of the Temperance Problem is to teach the individual man and woman, and still more the individual boy and girl, to be temperate. Much of the older enthusiasm seems to have died out here, and Temperance meetings have too often become the happy hunting-ground of the faddist and the man with a gift for anecdote. Bands of Hope and similar efforts also seem to have become hopelessly stereotyped, and the really enthusiastic worker, clerical or lay, with a power of inspiring souls is gone from among us. Yet the problem is far more pressing than even before, because the leisure time of all classes, even of the very poorest, is rapidly increasing; and at the same time on every side new opportunities for amusement are springing up. The children of to-day when they reach manhood will probably find six or seven hours work a day sufficient to provide all the necessities and comforts of life. What will they do with all the many hours of the day? Here I believe is the opportunity of the Church to make self-control and rational recreation the ideal of manliness among the young. The old methods of teaching have ceased to appeal. They date from the mind and methods of fifty years ago and need to be brought up to date and adapted to the temperament of the boys and girls of to-day. How this can be done I leave to others, for this is not my branch of the Temperance Problem, but I lay supreme stress upon it at the outset of this paper because I am entirely convinced that the ultimate solution of the problem depends far less on the statesman and the law than on the teacher and the moral atmosphere of the country.

Passing now to the legal and political side of the question, the prospects are, I believe, distinctly hopeful. The perplexing question of compensation, which diverted so much Temperance energy from more profitable fields, has been settled at any rate for the present, and the total failure of the prohibition campaign has at last convinced even the U.K.A. that in Temperance, as in all other reforms, extreme measures cannot be carried. The consequence is twofold, for there is

now far more union among reformers than ever before. Lord Peel's Commission for the first time outlined a Temperance policy that could attract the average thoughtful man who realized the evils resulting from the excessive drinking prevalent among certain classes, and was anxious to see them mitigated, but who yet had never been convinced that the prohibition policy of the older Temperance leaders was possible. Lord Peel's work has now been taken over by the Temperance Legislation League, and it is evident from the support they have already secured that we have at last a Temperance programme which will appeal to all sections of Temperance opinion, and at the same time win sufficient support from the general public not only to carry it into law, but also, what is far more important, to carry the law into operation once it is passed.

The Licensing Act of 1904 also has been of great use in defining the present policy of all reformers. In the famous Clause 4 Parliament has embodied in law a clear ideal of what the licence of the future should be. By this clause the profits of all *new* licences are to belong to the public, and the licensing authorities are to be free to impose on them whatever conditions they think best in the public interest, and further they are to take into consideration the effect of these conditions on the trade of the house in estimating the profit belonging to the public. This is a great gain, for, as population nowadays develops in new areas with ever-increasing rapidity, the new licences will be in the near future the important ones. Further it is clear that two classes of licences, the old one lightly taxed and free from magisterial control, and the new one heavily taxed and under complete control, cannot continue permanently to exist side by side. The very absurdity of the fact that the publican made no payment for the old licence and pays fully for the more limited new one, is itself sufficient to make the abolition of the distinction inevitable sooner or later. The length of the time limit is comparatively unimportant, but the new Clause 4 licence must become the universal licence of the future.

The 1904 Act supplied yet another rallying-ground for all Temperance reformers when it became evident from the decision of the Courts in the case of the Birkenhead Justices that the power of the Justices to impose conditions on the older licences had been destroyed by the new Act. This result had been clearly foretold by the opponents of the Act in the course of the debates; and amendments were moved to avoid it. The Government, however, persisted in declaring that their fears were groundless, and that the Act left these powers untouched.

The imposition of conditions on licences, indeed, did not in the past depend on any statutory power of the Justices, but on their power of refusing the grant or renewal of a licence for any reason, so that they were always able to secure whatever conditions they thought proper by refusing to grant the licence at all, unless the conditions were accepted by the grantee. It is true not much use had been made of their power in the past, because active Temperance opinion had concentrated itself on the one point of securing the abolition of public-houses, and had refused seriously to consider any steps for their improvement. Opinion,

however, was waking up to the immense importance of improving the conditions at the very moment when the 1904 Act deprived the Justices of this power, and its restoration must stand in the forefront of the Temperance programme of to-day. The public-house, we can all agree, should not be a mere drinking resort owned and managed chiefly with the object of securing an outlet for the beers of some particular firm of brewers. It is the old club-house of the poorer classes, and was intended to be a place of general refreshment under decent conditions for all those who wished to use it. To-day the demand for other refreshments than alcoholics is growing by leaps and bounds, and every development of our means of locomotion increases it. Yet go into the average public-house, and it is obvious at once that it caters only for the drinker of alcoholics. Again, it certainly cannot conduce to a strict control of excessive drinking for the livelihood of those connected with the house to be practically dependent on the amount of liquor sold.

Under the present system, indeed, I have always failed to see how we can expect the publican to be more self-denying than other tradesmen, and to sacrifice his living for the good of his customers. We should see that he is secured a living wage, and then make it his first duty to see that the liquor he sells does no harm to his customers. But these and many other matters are all questions of the conditions under which the trade is carried on and not its abolition. They are all matters which can be quite adequately dealt with by the justices if only an enlightened public opinion will back them up, and if their old power of imposing conditions on licences be restored. In this direction, indeed, I believe lies our chief hope and chief work of the future. We must first secure a complete restoration of the power to impose conditions, and then we must see that it is fully and wisely used.

Two other very important results have also followed from the Act of 1904. It has given a great impetus to the formation of clubs, and it has largely resulted in the final disappearance of the old-fashioned private licence-holder. The reduction of the older licences, and the stringent conditions which the Act imposes on all new licences have indeed opened quite a new aspect of the club question. Hitherto they have increased comparatively slowly, and, while the need of more supervision has been generally recognized, all clubs have been regarded as being of the same general character, organized for social, political, or other similar purposes. Now, however, there is a real danger of a new type of club springing up merely to replace the public-house, and having no genuine membership purpose at all except that of drinking. At the moment, the brewery interest is opposed to clubs and has joined hands with Temperance reformers to press upon the Government the need of further legislation. This alliance, however, is only temporary, and is due to the brewers being at present the owners of the public-houses only. In many instances, however, they are already beginning to build clubs instead, and there is little doubt that unless clubs of this character are very promptly brought under the same regulations, and especially under the same taxation, as public-houses,

within a very few years this will become the general policy of the trade. The connexion of the club may not always be evident, but it is quite clear that the ordinary members of the labouring classes who use these buildings cannot possibly find the necessary capital to erect them independently, and the "tie" can be arranged in many ways quite outside any public form of control. The growth of this type of spurious club will also be much accelerated by the fact that not only do clubs only pay 5s. registration fee while a licensed house pays according to the annual value a licence duty of from £4 10s. to £55, but the new monopoly value charge is imposed only on the licensed houses. This charge is defined in the Act as "the difference between the value which the premises will bear when licensed, and the value of the same premises if they were not licensed", which the Justices are bound by Clause 4 of the Act to impose on all new licences, may be a very large sum working out at a considerable sum per barrel. In one case the charge was £5,000, and in another £2,500, amounting to a tax of approximately 25 per cent. of the entire gross profits of the alcoholic sales. From all these financial burdens the club is free, and it therefore needs no prophet to foretell that, if this amazing distinction is allowed to remain as licences are abolished or refused, the proprietary club will more than take its own place. The old argument that you cannot legislate for the working man's club without interfering with those in Pall Mall, disappears at once in the face of the new conditions. It is perfectly easy to distinguish between a club where the expenses are mainly paid by subscriptions, and those which depend mainly on their liquor sales. In the Reform Club, for instance, the liquor profits in 1905 amounted only to £760 against over £19,000 from subscriptions and rents. Clubs where more than a certain proportion of the expenditure is met by the liquor profits being in reality disguised public-houses, should be under the same control. Certainly, also, liquor sold in clubs should bear the same public charges as if sold in a licensed house.

I would urge special attention to both these points. Then reforms can be secured now because the new club system is only just commencing. Comparatively few persons are financially interested in it, and the brewers are on our side because their main interest lies in protecting from competition the public-houses they own. If we let this chance go by we shall very soon have to fight as great a vested interest in clubs as there now is in public-houses, and the whole effect of any reduction in the number of licences will be entirely lost.

The other unforeseen effect of the 1904 Act, to which I have alluded, is the final disappearance of the private licence-holder. He must, I believe, accept the fact that he cannot exist under modern conditions. The old conception of a licence was, that where one was required it might be given to any respectable man with a reasonably-sized house. No special accommodation, little capital, and less knowledge was required to enable the old-fashioned publican to do very well. Now all this is changed. In competing for the old houses the brewer, as he secures a wholesale profit of from 10s. to 20s. per barrel apart altogether

from the retail profit in the house, can afford to give a rental (or price) which makes any profit on the management of the house impossible, and consequently makes it quite impossible for any "free tenant" to compete with him. In new houses he has even more complete monopoly. These must be built to a special plan, often in a very elaborate way. A large capital expenditure is required, and at the same time the monopoly value charge takes away all chance of the house ever yielding more than a moderate business return on the capital invested. As a matter of strict law, indeed, the monopoly value charge should appropriate the wholesale profit for the public. For it rests on precisely the same definition of value as the compensation payment defined in Clause 2 of the Act, and Mr. Justice Kennedy's decision has finally included the wholesale profit in this valuation. If this was enforced it is certain no new licence would be applied for by any one! The practice of many Justices of making the surrender of old licences a condition precedent to the grant of a new one is a further safeguard to the brewers, for as they already own almost all the existing licences they alone can fulfil the required conditions.

It is clear that this state of things is unhealthy; for it amounts to the development of a complete monopoly of both present and future licensing in the hands of a small number of existing brewery firms. The remedy, however, is not to be found in trying to bolster up the obsolescent system of private licence-holders, but by adapting our legislation to the new order of things. In the first place, the fiction that licence-holders are still bona fide tenants should be frankly abandoned both in legislation and in administration. We know perfectly well that they are managers, and in any new system must always be managers only. If the licence were frankly recognized as a licence to the actual owner or leaseholder of the house, and endorsed for each offence, whether the managers were changed or not, but at the same time every facility given to the licensee to get rid of an undesirable manager, there would be a much more effective control than there is now.

Then is it not clear that, as the private licence-holder has failed us as a competitor to the brewers and cannot be resuscitated under modern conditions, we must develop some other system to take his place? We cannot possibly submit to a universal brewing monopoly. The various Trust Companies, the Gottenberg system, and similar organizations, seem to supply the proper lines of this new development. They have taken different shapes in different places. Some have succeeded, some have failed, but they all embody the two cardinal principles that must, I believe, be the basis of the licensing system of the future.

1. That the remuneration of those concerned in the distribution of alcoholics should be by fixed payments independent of the actual sales, and that the control of the retail trade should be in the hands of disinterested persons of independent position.

2. That the profit of the licence beyond the cost of working it belongs to the public, and not to the public holder.

The first principle amounts to the substitution of officials whose

sole interest is to secure good management for tradesmen whose income necessarily depends on the amount of their sales. "Good management" is in fact substituted for "private profit" as the chief interest of the manager, and his whole sympathy is enlisted on the side of reform instead of being in opposition to anything that will diminish the alcoholic trade of the house.

The second principle, that the profit of the licence belongs to the public, has been so fully accepted by the 1904 Act in Clause 4 that it needs no further justification. The experience, however, of the last four years, as to the difficulty of fairly assessing the monopoly value where licences are granted to private persons, must result in more use being made of the Trusts. The only fair method of assessing the charge is to make it vary with the trade of the house, for working expenses do not increase at all in the same proportion as the sales. Such a fluctuating charge can only be properly levied if proper books are kept, and if the licensees have no interest in concealing their actual profits. It will always be difficult for private persons to fulfil these conditions, and the Trusts, therefore, can here be of real service to the licensing authorities.

With regard to the actual results so far secured by the system in Norway or Sweden, where it has been longest under trial, the evidence is overwhelming, not only as to the reduction in the consumption of spirits, to which also the system applies, but also as to the greater degree of public control secured.

In Gottenberg, for instance. The bar sales of spirits per inhabitant in 1875 was 12.99 litres, and in 1904 only 5.72 litres. In Bergen the bar sales have declined from 2.45 litres in 1877 to .87 in 1901. The two following paragraphs from the Report of the Commission sent to Norway by the Scottish Temperance Legislation Board in 1906 sum up the results concisely :—

"A deep impression was created in our minds by the emphatic declarations made by Norwegians of all classes in favour of the management system. The unhesitating approval of the system by statesmen, clergymen, physicians, town councillors, police authorities, the Press, employers of labour, labour leaders, and working men, was very remarkable. But more significant than this was the agreement among 'totallists' and prohibitionists that the management system was a powerful aid to sobriety, inasmuch as it helped to restrain excessive drinking, and thereby raised the moral standard of every town in which it was at work."

Again : "Our own impression, gathered from a close study of the principle and practice of the liquor licensing laws of Norway, from a personal investigation of the premises of the Samlap, and of every quarter of several towns by day and by night, is that the towns of Norway and the towns of great Britain cannot be compared. They can only be contrasted. The sobriety of Norway is as evident as the inebriety of Great Britain."

At home the system has now been in operation in the case of the People's Refreshment House Association for a period of ten years, and has received a great extension since 1901 when Lord Grey began the

formation of the County Trusts. At the present time there are thirty-eight different bodies at work and 233 houses are under reformed management.

The difficulties have been very great, and in some cases they have undoubtedly led to the failure of the undertaking. To begin with, many of those who were most enthusiastic about the system knew very little about the actual conditions of the trade, and wild statements were made as to the available profits which led the public to believe that every public-house was a gold mine. It is perfectly true that the total profits on the liquor sold in England are enormous, but competition has long ago run up both the price and the rental of licensed houses to such a figure that the profit left to the actual licence-holder, after the working expenses and the rent (or the interest on the purchase money) has been paid, is comparatively small. Messrs. Sherwell and Rowntree have unfortunately done much harm here, for in their excellent book they quote the nominal profit but they do not quote any figures as to the amount of the present capital value of the houses or as to the working expenses. Much disappointment has in consequence been caused by the failure of many of the Trusts to make a commercial success of their business. Again, they have been seriously hampered by the fact that in no instance have they yet secured the complete monopoly of a district. Another difficulty arising out of the smallness of the net profit in most public-houses (i. e. the balance remaining after the rent and all expenses of working have been paid) is that few Trusts have been able to organize an adequate office staff and inspectorate. These cost money, for the man with the gift of organization and the power of keeping other men up to the mark is a very valuable person in any business. Then in many places it has been difficult to find men of leisure with sufficient business ability and enthusiasm to fulfil properly the duties of director, and in almost all cases it has been impossible to raise the capital required for a proper development of the system. The actual managers, too, in the houses, have also had to be trained in a new conception of their position. It is indeed often curious even now to note in a Trust house that, though the manager makes a personal profit out of every cup of tea and every bottle of minerals and gains nothing whatever from the alcoholic sales, he is often much keener on the bar than on the tea room.

All these difficulties, however, are gradually being overcome, and the new type of public-house that the movement has developed throughout the country is becoming increasingly popular. The greater cleanliness, the bright tea rooms, the absence of alcoholic advertisements, and the ready provision of foods and Temperance refreshment, mark out the houses clearly enough. These difficulties, however, and especially the inability of an ordinary private Trust to procure sufficient capital to develop new districts in face of brewery competition show that some further organization is required if the threatened brewery monopoly is to be checked. Some have proposed to use the municipal authorities here and to entrust the new licenses to their control. Such a course would inevitably be very dangerous.

A considerable section of the electorate is very susceptible to liquor influence, and municipal elections would certainly suffer if that question were introduced. Control by elected representatives of those who use the houses would certainly not tend to greater strictness in management. At a recent election of Guardians in Bradford a "private and confidential" circular was sent to all licence-holders by representatives of the trade in the city pointing out to them that they could each influence ten or more votes! But it would be a great gain if some official commission were organized with power to provide the necessary machinery in cases where the local licensing authorities wished either to create new licences or to transfer the old licences from private to "disinterested" management. Such a commission might be entrusted with the proceeds of the monopoly value charge, and empowered to use it to the financing of new licences, where required, in new districts, and also for gradually buying up and transferring to disinterested management those existing licences which are not redundant, and which therefore do not come within the scope of the compensation claims of the 1904 Act. The present distinction of the M.V. charge is certainly unsatisfactory, as it practically goes to the relief of the local rates, while there is no means of dealing with the non-redundant old licences except through the time limit scheme. By using the M.V. charge on new licences and by gradually buying the old licences up and transferring them to disinterested management all hardship would be avoided, and in time the entire licensed system would be brought under public management, and the brewer again relegated to his proper work—that of brewing good beer.

In conclusion, I should like to emphasize once more my conviction that the key of the whole problem is to be found in the question of management. Abolition may or may not produce the results its advocates expect. Of its success I am myself doubtful, for experience shows that the trade, if unduly restricted in one shape, can easily develop in others less easy of control. Clubs are already taking the place of licensed houses. Bottled beers, which can be delivered from house to house, have in many cases already ruined the public-house trade in draught ale, and now draught ale itself is being put into quart bottles, and a gallon of ale in this convenient form can now be bought for 1s. 3d. by any cottager, delivered at his own door. Under such circumstances the value of abolition is doubtful. Improved management on the other hand, and the development of the social and non-alcoholic side of public-houses can do nothing but good, and it is therefore in this direction, and in the education of the young, that I trust the chief work of our Church will be found in the future.

[Published for the Pan-Anglican Congress Committees, who alone are responsible for these Papers.]

Being Problems for consideration at the *Pan-Anglican Congress*, 1908

LUXURY

BY THE REV. P. DEARMER, VICAR OF ST. MARY'S,
PRIMROSE HILL, LONDON, N.W.

THE problem of Luxury is fundamentally important. It is simple enough, also; and yet the majority of men err about it. The well-to-do generally think that by spending large sums on selfish indulgences they are conferring a mysterious benefit upon the working classes; and the average working man is still apt to regard the extravagancies of the rich as useful to the poor because they give "employment". In fact the fallacy that "Luxury is good for trade" is still current to a remarkable extent.

Here, then, is something that lies at the root both of ethics and economics, something which is the main cause of our frightful present-day Mammon-worship,¹ and the main cause, also, of our vast, degrading poverty—something which comes up as a practical question to all of us every day of our lives, whether we be rich or poor,² and yet something which we are content to settle by a fallacy. Every day people are increasing their luxurious expenditure—for instance, the fashionable lady who a generation ago spent £300 or £400 a year on dress (which was bad enough) now spends, according to an able critic,³ double and treble that amount. In some cases, no doubt, this is because people are deliberately wicked; but in the majority it is surely due to ignorance and thoughtlessness—to the want of thought that does more harm than want of heart. People do this sort of thing in the main because they lay the pleasant unction to their souls that they are conferring a benefit on the poor by their own vanity and selfishness. Luxury, they fancy, is good for trade.

Now, even if luxury were good for trade, it would still remain a truism that there are higher things than trade, and that luxury is not good for religion or for morals. If there is one thing about which all historians are agreed it is that the decline of the great nations of the past has been due to the spread of luxury. Trade did not save them; and trade will not save us, unless we sweep back the growing tide of self-indulgence. The theologians, the philosophers, and all the great teachers of mankind are as unanimous as the historians. The matter is so clear that it would be waste of space—and a luxury of print—to dwell upon it here. The Old Testament and the New Testament, the

¹ What the "desire to be rich" may lead to may be studied in *The Jungle*, by Upton Sinclair.

² The poor of England manage to spend in luxuries, according to Professor Marshall's estimate, about £100,000,000 per annum, mainly, no doubt, in alcohol and gambling. This represents, of course, a small amount per head compared with the £400,000,000 spent in luxuries by the rich.

³ Lady Jeune (Lady St. Helier), *Lesser Questions*.

fathers and saints, and heroes and reformers, of the entire Christian history speak with one voice on this matter, and that a stern and terrible voice. And natural science is in the same camp with theology: the twenty-five men who dined in a London hotel this year at £100 per head may have been muddle-headed as to the benefit they were conferring upon society; but the doctors would be quite clear as to the effect of such dining upon the digestion.

The question of luxury is thus really a simple one. If you see a little boy eating up all the food at his end of the table, you do not say that it is good for the butcher and the baker; but that it is bad for the other boys who are hungry, and even worse for the greedy one himself. It is just the same in larger things: we are greedy, and we are very cruel.

There remains the economic point. All the wisdom of the world is against the luxurious man; but he shuts his conscience with the plea that *one* science, that of political economy, outweighs all the rest; and so he, careless enough about all economic and social science, justifies himself with an argument from popular "political economy".

And this one argument of his is an economic fallacy. For the economists are at one with religion in condemning luxury. Professor Laveleye in his book on the subject¹ says:—

"Primitive Christianity reproved it in the name of charity and of humility; political economy condemns it in the name of utility, and right condemns it in the name of equity."

The classical illustration of the economic effect of luxury is the breaking of a pane of glass. We may put it in this way:—

If Jones breaks a pane of glass that costs 3s. 6d. to replace, the glazier is very pleased and thinks that the waste of glass is a benefit to trade. But is it? Jones has lost the money *which he would anyhow have paid to some form of trade*. Suppose he had intended to spend it on mending his boots, what is the net result of the transaction? The glazier makes 3s. 6d., but the cobbler loses this 3s. 6d., which he would have otherwise made: so the one cancels the other, and trade stands just where it was, with the important difference that Jones's boots let in water. The community as a whole is 3s. 6d. poorer, and suffers to that extent.

Or, take it a step farther. Sir Humphrey de Jones, a moderate drinker, spends £3 a week on his dinner champagne. The wine-merchant of course is delighted, and says that trade is benefited—meaning of course his trade. In this case it is not Sir Humphrey's cobbler who loses; for Sir Humphrey has a plethora of boots—and of course it is true that if Sir Humphrey saved his £3 he might spend it in worse ways, though even if he did he would still be giving the same amount of employment. But supposing the wages of Sir Humphrey's sixty labourers were raised from ten to twelve shillings a week, would it not be better for them and their children? And "trade" would benefit just the same, for each of the labourers would be giving larger orders to their tradesmen to exactly the same amount. Or, if you like, suppose that Sir Humphrey spends this £3 a week on supporting six young men who are called by God to train for the ministry: each of those men is

¹ E. de Laveleye, *Luxury*, cap. I. (Translations: Sonnenschein, 1891.)

being brought up to the service of God and of man, and the ten shillings which each costs goes into the tradesman's pockets just the same. Or, again, suppose that Sir Humphrey (a converted man) saves so much by cutting down his luxuries all round that he is able to found a garden city: his money still goes in wages—bricklayers and carpenters, builders and architects, thrive on it—and a slum population is redeemed.

Homely illustrations like these serve to express the economic fact that money spent on luxuries is spent *unproductively*, while such money diverted to good and necessary things is also spent in wages but is spent productively. If for Jones's 3s. 6d., or Sir Humphrey's £3, we read £500,000,000, which Professor Marshall estimates as the sum spent annually by the rich and poor of England "in ways that do little or nothing towards making life nobler or truly happier",¹ we shall have some idea of the magnitude of the evil. In the drier language of the textbooks the nature of luxury as employing unproductive labour is expressed, as in Walker's standard *Political Economy*:—

"On the other hand, there is a disposition very frequently manifested to applaud luxurious expenditure, even in its most extravagant form, as a good thing in itself, because it 'makes trade good', 'puts money into circulation', 'gives employment to labour', &c. Whenever any great exhibition of extravagance is given, there are always found those who approve it for such reasons.

"Again, we say, those who take this view of the expenditure of wealth see only one side of the case. While most forms of extreme luxury do, at the time, give employment to labour and give a 'flip' to trade, there is almost always some use to which that wealth might have been applied which would have proved, in the long run, much more beneficial to the community at large and to the labouring class in particular."²

Now, vast numbers of our people are living in degrading and pitiable want, and are dragging up inefficient children to swell the future ranks of the unemployable. In London alone, Mr. Charles Booth tells us³ that there are 1,400,000 people living in miserable poverty, and other investigations have shown that other towns are no better.⁴ Now, why is this? Broadly speaking, it is because so much is spent on luxuries that there is not enough for necessities.⁵ Luxury is, in fact, the open sore which drains out the blood of the nation.

But art, and comfort, and science, and the mastery of nature are not luxuries, and education is not a luxury, and religion is not a luxury. These things are needful for a high and generous life, and the right progress of civilization does mean an increase in human wants. Public

¹ Alfred Marshall, *Elements of Economics of Industry*, 3rd edition, p. 356. Macmillan, 1900.

² Francis A. Walker, *First Lessons in Political Economy*, p. 306. Macmillan, 1890.

³ Charles Booth, *Life and Labour of the People*.

⁴ e.g., B. S. Rowntree, *Poverty: A Study of Town Life*. Macmillan, 4th ed., 1902.

⁵ For the statistics of these contrasts of modern society, see L. G. Chiozza Money, M.P., *Riches and Poverty*. Methuen, 1905.

expenditure (which is just what the well-to-do are apt to grumble at when the tax-collector appears) might well be far larger than at present; the most priceless picture, the rarest music, the most costly pageant, after all cost little enough if reckoned by the number of people who profit by them. There is no need to starve our lives; there is enough and to spare in the vast income of the nation—of any nation—if only it be not squandered by a thoughtless minority. As a matter of fact private luxury now walks side by side with public squalor, and London, but for its core of palaces and its fringe of villas, is hideous and miserable as it has never been before since first it was built.¹ To bring peace and happiness to the submerged multitudes will need a vast expenditure, and indeed will only be possible by a renunciation of the private waste in display and self-indulgence. “Men shall be simple in their homes and splendid in their public ways.” We must bring home the truth to people—the moral which is also the economic truth: for the splendour of Solomon will only be ours in so far as we seek first the Kingdom and the Justice of God.

Meanwhile luxury increases and poverty grows no less. And the duty of the Church is to hold up the light to society.

¹ There are still, approximately, 1,000,000 paupers in England, according to the current official returns. In Japan, with a larger population, there are said to be only 29,000 (C. W. Saleeby, *The Doctor and the Simpler Life*, p. 10). But Japan has still a simple standard of life.

[Published for the Pan-Anglican Congress Committees, who alone are responsible for these Papers.]

SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE.

LONDON: NORTHUMBERLAND AVENUE, W.C.

1908.

PAN-ANGLICAN PAPERS

Being Problems for consideration at the *Pan-Anglican Congress*, 1908.

SWEATING

By MISS GERTRUDE M. TUCKWELL

WHAT is Sweating? The reply was framed for us now some fifteen years ago by Lord Dunraven's Committee of the House of Lords, who, after lengthy deliberations and the accumulation of a vast amount of evidence, arrived at a definition. Bad conditions of employment, long hours and a low rate of wage, when combined, were held to constitute "Sweating". The Blue Books which contain the evidence have been shelved, the poor witnesses who furnished the greater part of the record have returned to dismal tenement and mean street, or passed away to give place to fresh hordes of sweated workers. The sole practical result of the deliberations of the Committee exists in their precise statement.

It is a curious fact that having got our definition and paid heavily for it, we should still find a popular impression that instances of "sweating" are confined to the home. The shop assistant, working often under the hardest conditions of employment—anaemic and sickly from long hours and vitiated atmosphere—with insufficient pay to enable her to supplement the inadequate meals provided for her; the typist or clerk sitting all day in an airless basement and working till late into the night for 10s. or 15s. a week, are types of sweated labour. Even the conditions of work in factory or workshop may absolutely fulfil the requirements of our definition.

Nor must it be supposed that women alone are the victims of the system. At "The Sweated Industries" Exhibition organized in London in 1906, as at that in Chicago, men worked side by side with women in tailoring, umbrella making, and many another trade. Both in the home and in the factory the sweated labour of men is to be found.

Because of the depression and ignorance of these lowest strata of labour, trades may be found lingering which under ordinary and healthy circumstances would have long since died out as a home industry. In trades like matchbox or tie making, or straw-plaiting, prices are depressed not by the cupidity of the employer, but by a competition with machinery, and a hopeless sacrifice of labour ensues. Sometimes the ignorant attempts at help on the part of the charitable intensify the evil. The home workers' struggle is also rendered more acute by the competition with goods produced under favoured conditions and subsidized in Institutions. The under-selling thus arrived at is peculiarly mischievous, and this amateur method of partially supporting Homes, Institutions, or Societies by under-selling ordinary labour cannot be too strongly condemned.

The existence of the erroneous popular belief that sweating exists in the home alone, is due probably to the fact that the larger number

of instances to be discovered in any one class of work-place are to be found there, and that owing to the absence of sufficient protective legislation its evils are there intensified. For factory and workshop we possess a people's charter—a strong regulating code. The rise of the factory system—superseding the old and more personal relation of employer and employed—with its attendant miseries of an exploitation of child labour, more serious even than that which confronts us in the Southern States of America to-day, roused the public opinion of this country more than fifty years ago. The wave of feeling, instead of being uselessly dissipated, as many such a tide of popular sympathy has been before and since, was utilized to afford the impulse for legislative action, and the first instalment of our factory code appeared.

The law which regulated this previously unchecked supply of cheap labour, and prevented the maiming and torture of the children, was followed by proposals to control the labour of women, and finally to some extent that of men. The old principle affirmed over and over again by Parliament, that the protection of the people is the business of the State, is merely restated in our factory code to suit new conditions. Imperfect, and in many cases still ill-enforced, it stands as an enormous power for good.

But our growing code of factory law has to a great extent ignored the home, and each fresh regulation for factory or workshop has intensified the depression of the home worker in the scale of labour. Driven into attics or cellars of the heavily rented tenements of our big cities, the family can afford sometimes but a single room, which forms the dwelling-place, the workroom, kitchen, nursery, laundry, sick-room, and mortuary for all. Here the children are born into the midst of toil and squalor; here at tenderest ages they join the army of wage earners, working before and after the hours of school-time, from early morning till late at night. Some of the evidence just taken before the present Committee of the House of Commons showed that children are working in some of the small hardware trades of Birmingham at the age of four and five years, and the Report of another Committee (on wage-earning children) gives the hours spent in wage-earning in some cases by little children as forty to fifty a week. Every member of the family is pressed into the service—idiot and “defective”, old and young. Work in such a home is everywhere: it serves as a substitute for the children's toys, it lies on the bed of the woman whose child has been born but six hours and her tired fingers take it up; it drops only from hands that are dead. Of the courage, the patience, the dignity of such lives it is difficult to say enough. But the measure of our respect is also that of our bewilderment that, having by Commissions and Committees laid bare their hidden stories, we should still be hesitating before measures of redress.

The struggle of old and young, of sick and unfit in a fight for existence; the intensity of the work; the fact that all alike are labouring, has for its secret the wage received. In such cases the payment for work done falls to the sum of 1*d.* an hour, and the interminable labour of every member of the family cannot produce

a living wage. The inadequate pay of many classes of men's labour is notorious. The average pay of women has been stated, and I think fairly, at somewhere between 7s. and 8s. Rising in the great textile trades of the North to an average of over 15s., it descends in the case of some home workers to precarious earnings of 3s. and 4s. Nor, within certain limits, does any uniformity govern the rates of pay. There is ignorance not only on the part of the workers as to rates paid elsewhere, but the employers confess to the same position. "If you can prove to me that more is being paid by others for this work I will raise my prices," is a frequent statement, and a typical instance of the good faith with which this may be urged was shown in a case not long ago where an employer raised his payments from 2s. 11d. to 5s. 9d. a dozen for making certain goods, on proof being given him that he was underselling his rivals.

I myself have found a difference of 1s. or 1s. 6d. per dozen between the rates paid by different firms for the same work, and even for the same work payments by the same firm will frequently vary. The fact that goods for which 2s. and 3s. a dozen are received by the worker may ultimately fetch 16s. or 17s. in the shops, suggests that when all the expenses of rent, management, and general upkeep of factory and shop are met, the margin for the higher rate exists.

I lay stress on wage, putting its regulation before that of any other condition of employment, because on it depend health, comfort, life itself, yet its insufficiency at present is such that the situation of thousands of our workers is summed up by the woman who told us "you may as well starve without the work as with it".

Every now and then some police court story brings to light a case in which such a worker has gone under, and starvation or attempted suicide has ended all.

I may be told that on the whole these incidents are rare; but to admit this is only to confront as serious a problem, for help must come from outside sources, since one cannot live on 5s. a week. So the Poor Law feebly supplements these wretched earnings, neighbours slightly better off give of their own poverty, Churches and Missions contribute to stave off starvation—somebody pays!

Thus, a rate in aid of wages is set up to perpetuate a system by which the reward of labour received from the employer is habitually insufficient.

With wages thus supplemented, we hear comparatively little of starvation, but those of us who face the truth know that year by year, with help as casual and ill-regulated as are the conditions of labour to which it is directed, we perpetuate a system by which sickly, anaemic workers are rearing a still feebler generation, whose fight for work must be appreciably weaker, who soon inevitably swell the ranks of the unemployable and disappear into the abyss.

I have recapitulated these facts, and all who feel their responsibility for such ills in the State of which they are citizens must feel also that their survey is a challenge to redress them.

Redress, indeed, is long overdue, for we are a slow moving and

conservative people, and many of us, well-meaning but bewildered, have been hushed into acquiescence by fallacies masquerading as Political Economy. The value of that science has been indisputable; the attempt to marshal and arrange all the available facts and to reduce to a body of doctrine teachings based on study of our economic problems has had a great educational influence. It has led numbers of people to try and think out social difficulties for themselves. Here, however, the value of Political Economy ceases. To erect into laws of the Medes and Persians theories which vary in different countries, which are modified in our own from day to day, is absurd.

If the question is one of "worth" to the State, I can imagine no more extravagant method than that by which we buy labour at a price which renders it increasingly inefficient, in the next generation inevitably increases the problem of the unemployable, perpetually asks of the public to assist the employer in keeping alive those who are properly his charge. It would be difficult, I think, to establish, if we are to adjudicate on what a man is "worth" to the State, that the Coats combine, that the Vanderbilts and the Carnegies, are "worth" the enormous share of profits accumulated in their hands. Colossal fortunes on the one hand, a precarious existence on *1d.* or *2d.* an hour on the other, do not constitute a healthy State. We hear of iron laws of wages, of laws of supply and demand, fixed and unmovable. All study of Industry shows that none of these laws is immutable, that all are susceptible of modification.

One instance stands out in my mind—the picture of the condition of the Lancashire textile worker already named, where for an eight hours day, without overtime, with work carried on in large airy factories, the woman's average wage is somewhere about *15s.* a week. Here, in contrast to the prompt dismissal of the isolated worker who states a grievance, difficulties as to wage are settled by interviews between appointed representatives of workers and employers.

The difference is caused by the workers' Trade Unions. These great textile combinations, in which more than 80,000 of the members are women, exercise an upward pressure in their trade against the constant downward tendency of wage in the struggle between capital and labour. They claim and gain a reward for their labour, which constitutes a living wage. Wages are the least the employer can get the worker to take, and the most the worker can get the employer to give, we are told, and considering the forces which fight the battle of capital, it is essential that the worker should be in a position to bargain equally for his share of profits.

What has come of this interference with "iron laws"? Nothing but good; for the worker leisure, comfort, room to live has resulted; for the employer himself larger profits arising from the increased efficiency of the worker; for the State generations of capable citizens. Such might also have been the position of the sweated worker. But we are moving in a vicious circle, and each generation sinks lower than the last. Underpayment begets inefficiency, and miserable conditions create the unemployable.

There is another direction in which we are perpetually modifying "the laws of Political Economy"; and that is by the worker's charter of factory law of which I have already written. The statutes which to some extent regulate the supply of child labour, limit hours of work, forbid the employment of mothers immediately after child-birth, and attempt to deal with all tampering with wage, are, in the opinion of old-fashioned Economists, an interference with "the laws of Political Economy". The tendency of modern labour-legislation is to relieve pressure on the labour market.

By the admission of all statesmen of all parties it has brought many blessings to the community.

The problem which confronts us is how to regulate the chaos of such inferior labour conditions as I have described; how to put the sweated worker in a position to bargain with his employer for a living wage. This cannot be reached as yet by the voluntary combination of a Trade Union; the sweated worker has sunk too low in the scale for that. The foresight which makes it possible to see beyond the day's struggle and the capacity for corporate action are gone; to demand a contribution to Trade Union funds from miserable earnings is to ask too great a sacrifice.

The precedent for dealing with such a situation has been established by every law for the protection of the worker, from the old times when rulers considered it their business to obtain for the worker "a convenient" wage, down to the Factory Law which, with its elaborate provisions for guarding children, young persons, and women, is a perpetual affirmation of the principle that the defence of its weaker citizens is the duty of the State. That regulation of wages which the great Unions secure for themselves must be secured by law for those too weak to bargain, and we must take a lesson from Australasia and New Zealand in dealing with our sweated trades.

Let me instance Victoria, whose solution of the problem seems peculiarly applicable to our condition. Here, the method resembles that already followed by several of our great Unions, in which Boards of employer and employed are formed to fix a standard minimum rate. The Victorian Parliament intervenes where cause is shown, to call such Boards into existence, and the deliberations of these deputed representatives of master and worker, directed by a Chairman of authority, fix the rate which the trade can bear. About forty of such Boards are now in existence, and their result has been not only the evolving of order out of chaotic conditions, but generally speaking a considerable rise in the minimum rate paid. South Australia has followed the example set by Victoria.

It is true that for a problem compact of causes so various, one solution alone is not enough. We must needs not only attack this question of the direct order and regulation of wage, but also by the extension and amplification of our Industrial laws, relieve the labour market of struggling hordes whose place is not in this arena. We need to develop the laws dealing with child labour till children disappear from the struggle for work, and are given back to school, to technical

training, and to play. We need to free the child-bearing woman from the necessity for wage earning. Old Age Pensions must provide rest for those whose working days are done, and a reconstituted Poor Law relieve us of the loafers and the unemployable. Nor will any such change involve new departures startling to the Conservative. We are but developing to meet existing needs, principles already laid down.

Surely, in such a case, had we been asked to do some great thing we would willingly have done it. Yet here I have suggested no great movement, only help in forwarding those measures, long overdue, which will enable us to feel that to some extent we have washed off the reproach of apathy and that before God our hands are clean.

There is a deep unrest among the people, a sense of suffering and injustice borne too long. They are not blind to the contrasts I have spoken of; they do not see unmoved vast fortunes spent in idle luxury while their nearest and dearest struggle with crushing poverty and want. They are turning away from the Churches, for there they find no large comprehension of their wrongs and needs, but rather an acquiescence in conditions that makes spiritual life impossible; for starvation is a soil in which piety cannot grow. Here and there a voice is raised which is reminiscent of the voice of Christianity's first founder, which recalls His rebuke of wealth and greed, but for the most part they are silent, ruling out of religion these questions on which our nation's life is based.

Will the Church rally to the people before it is found too late? This great Congress, with its delegates called from all corners of the earth, with its discussions and its prayer, with its offerings of men and money, may mark an epoch in our history.

To those of us who have loved and worked with "labour" the best thank-offering that can be offered to the Eternal is that of a Church vowed to the service of the people,—a Priesthood which shall turn from barren theological casuistry to comprehend the wrongs of labour, and to aid the new struggle for justice to the poor.

BOOKS FOR FURTHER STUDY ON SWEATED INDUSTRIES.

1. Government Reports on Sweating in London, 1887.
Government Reports on Sweating in Leeds, 1888.
2. Lords' Committee on Sweating, 8 vols., 1888-90.
3. Factory Inspectors' reports (annual).
4. A. Ballantyne, *Home Work (Dangerous Trades)*. Ed. by T. Oliver.
5. *Girl's Own Paper*, Vol. XXI.
6. C. Booth : *Life and Labour of the People*, 9 vols.
I. East London.
IV. Trades of East London.
IX. Conclusions, &c.
7. *Dictionary of Political Economy* (Palgrave).
I. Domestic System of Industry.
II. Sub-Contract.
III. Sweating.
8. *Economic Journal*, Vol. VI, pp. 153-4. 1896.

9. *Encyclopaedia of Social Reform* (Bliss).

1. Sweating.

2. Tailoring.

10. E. Y. Harrington: *The Sweating Problem and its Solution*. 1888.11. The Cry against Home Work. *Nineteenth Century*, Vol. XXXVI.12. The Wife's contribution to Family Income. *Economic Journal*, Vol. IV.13. *Problems of Poverty* (J. A. Hobson). 1891.

14. G. Howell: Conflicts of Capital and Labour.

15. T. Hurd: The Cry of the Children. Vide *The Ludgate*, Vols. IV, V.16. Margaret H. Irwin: Problem of Home Work. *Westminster Review*, Vol.

CXLVIII.

17. Charles Kingsley: *Alton Locke*. Cheap clothes and nasty.18. L. Lyons: *The Horrible Sweating System*. 1885.19. John Law: *Toilers in London*. 1889.20. J. Ramsey Macdonald: Sweating, its Cause and Cure. *Independent Review*, Vol. II.

21. 'Peter the Hermit,' The New Crusade (London East End Work and abuses).

22. Beatrice Potter (pamphlet): How best to do away with the Sweating System.

23. A. Sherwell: *Life in West London*.24. G. R. Sims: *How the Poor Live*. 1889.25. S. Webb: *Industrial Democracy*.26. Women's Industrial Council: *Home Industries of Women in London*. 1897.

[Published for the Pan-Anglican Congress Committees, who alone are responsible for these Papers.]

SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE.

LONDON: NORTHUMBERLAND AVENUE, W.C.

1908.



PAN-ANGLICAN PAPERS

Being Problems for consideration at the *Pan-Anglican Congress*, 1908.

THE FAMILY

By REGINALD A. BRAY, L.C.C.

To those who attack the family as an antiquated method of bringing up children there is always one simple reply. We may ask them what they would put in its place. Now for long years experiments have been made to find a substitute. The State, through the Poor Law system, has always been much exercised as to the best plan of dealing with the destitute orphans who fall to its care. Large institutions have been tried often and have as often failed; and now in this twentieth century of progress we are beginning to see that we cannot do better than imitate as nearly as we can, with our cottage homes and our scattered homes and our boarding-out, the time-worn institution of the family.

But the mere fact that the family has been attacked should compel us to go a little more deeply into the matter and inquire to what causes may be ascribed its unique value. They are two in number. In the first place the family is a natural source of pure and unselfish affection; and there is not too much pure and unselfish affection in the world for us lightly to cast away what little we possess. Secondly the family is small and the world is very big. Everywhere we are faced with the problem of vast numbers; and the mere contemplation of these empty magnitudes fills us with dismay and paralyses our energy. Our villages of yesterday have grown into the towns of to-day; our little towns of the past have swollen into those huge aggregations of population termed the modern city; and our empire, once confined to a few tiny islands in the Atlantic Ocean, is now scattered abroad over wide continents and remote seas, and shelters within its domains nearly a quarter of the peoples of the earth. We are told that we have a special duty to this great assemblage of souls, that we owe them our service and our love; and we hear the tidings with puzzled bewilderment, not knowing what we can do.

If we would do anything, we must content ourselves with an aim less ambitious than the desire to enfold the British Empire in our fond embrace by a single sweep of the arms. We must choose some smaller unit like the family and make the common life real and effective there. Then using this as the type of other relations and as a source of perennial energy, we may move outwards in a series of expanding circles, like the waves in a lake diverging from a central point of disturbance, until the far reeds, standing on the distant shores of humanity, tremble with the impulse which had its origin in the vitality of the home. "The family," says Mazzini, "is the heart's fatherland." The world is but an overgrown family; and the world's ideal—the ideal of an association regulated by mutual service and mutual goodwill—is the ideal most nearly realized within the home.

Three characteristics distinguish the life of the home. First, love, and not the expectation of reward, is the motive which sways conduct. The attempts of the young child to please his mother are merely so many expressions of the feelings with which he regards her. There is here no thought of securing any further gratification than that derived from the signs of happiness she will show. Secondly, to the

various services performed and received cling no taint of favour and patronage on the one hand, and no humiliating sense of dependence on the other. Here is the model community, where the weaker turns naturally towards the stronger, and the stronger shares his strength with the weaker, while both are the better for the interchange. Thirdly, while acting as the seed-bed of the emotions, the home supplies means of bringing these emotions to fruition instead of leaving them to die of inanition. A ready outlet for the discharge of feelings down the channel of action is provided. There is always some one to whom the child can show sympathy, a definite person who may be given a pleasure or spared a pain.

These three characteristics of the family—service from sympathy, service without a sense of patronage or humiliation, and service as the expression of each emotion—together constitute the ideal which should inspire the relation of man to his fellow creatures. The family then must be regarded as an element indispensable to the wellbeing of society. From the standpoint of Christianity there is an added reason for the preservation of the family; the fatherhood of God loses its appeal unless the relation of father to son, presented in fair and attractive colours, is realized in visible form.

But amid the stress and strain of modern life, in its setting of modern towns, the relation of the family over large sections of the community is threatened with destruction. Various causes contribute to this result. First and foremost there is the bitter struggle for the bare necessities of existence. The investigations of Mr. Charles Booth in London, and of Mr. Rowntree in York, have proved conclusively that the earnings of something like a third of the population are too small to insure the possession of the minimum requirements of a healthy life. One of the elements of the home must be sacrificed; either the house must be over-crowded, or the children badly clothed and badly nourished, or the parents insufficiently fed and consequently unfitted to take on their shoulders the burden of the daily routine, or as is more probable, a combination of the three evils. Failure everywhere stares the family in the face and the consciousness of this fact does not make for the vitality of the home. It may perhaps be urged that these things are not new phenomena, and the poor have been with us since the world began. But there has not been the squalid and joyless and isolated poverty of the modern town. In the village of a century ago there was pure air to breathe, wide spaces for play and recreation, the elements of a common life; and the incessant "speeding up" of the human machine had not yet begun. If the home conditions were bad and the earnings small, there was some compensation in the healthiness of the surroundings. The modern town demands more physical vigour and supplies the material for less. The huge aggregations of population create excitement and unrest but fail to provide any healthy channel for their discharge. If amusements are wanted, there is only the garish vulgarity of the music hall, and the unnatural indulgence in betting and drinking and gambling. The members of the family fall apart into detached units. The father is a random visitor, leaving early and returning late, and seen by his children on Sundays and Saturday afternoons. The mother, overburdened with the cares of the domestic duties, is glad to discharge the children into the street; and the children are glad to go and thus escape from the dullness and the confinement of the home.

Other factors of an economic nature accelerate the demoralization of the home. An element of uncertainty, baffling alike calculation and

forethought, menaces the security of the family. Even the highly skilled workman, in this age of specialization, knows that any day some new invention may destroy the capital he has invested in his own manual dexterity, and reduce him to the ranks of the unskilled labourer. Further there are many trades, seasonable in character, which can only flourish where there is a large body of casual workers who can be engaged when times are busy and cast off when times are slack. Again, under a régime of acute competition, many more business undertakings come into existence than can possibly survive. We have only to read the bankruptcy columns in the daily press to realize the extent of the evil. We read of companies being "wound up", and if we think at all, think only of the unfortunate shareholders. We seldom try to imagine what is happening to the workers employed in the business. But those behind the scenes watch the slow process of "the winding up" of many families. We see a comfortable cottage exchanged for a narrow tenement, we note the steady trickle of furniture and household goods to the pawnshops, till the family itself drifts away into the workhouse and is satisfactorily "wound up" in that great repository of bankrupt stock. Finally there is the steadily increasing exploitation of child labour. Once it was the duty of the employer to watch over and teach the boys in his service;—a duty enforced either by custom or by law. But this has long since become a mere relic of the past. The employer finds boy labour cheaper than adult labour, and has at his command an endless supply. He sucks up the intelligence and youthful energy of the boy, giving nothing in return but pieces of silver, and having sucked up all that is worth having casts him adrift when manhood is reached on to the waste-heaps of the unemployed or the unemployable. The parent is powerless; the uncertainty of his own work and the smallness of its precarious wages render indispensable to the family the earnings of the child. He fears to exert any parental control over the boy, lest the boy should take offence and leaving the home carry these earnings with him.

Thus, whether we look to the bitterness of the struggle to win for the home the bare necessities of existence, to the drudgery and soul-killing weariness of the household routine, or whether we study the conditions of present-day industrialism with its uncertainty for the worker, its demand for large supplies of casual labour, its frequent bankruptcies and the other vagaries of unregulated competition, and most serious of all its exploitation of the children, the same lesson is driven home to us—the family is going to pieces amid the exigencies of modern life. Another danger, perhaps the most serious of all, is threatening the sanctity of the home. The blow comes from a strangely unexpected quarter, from those who are often regarded as the strongest advocates of the family relation. Many persons of a rather academic type of mind are fiercely opposing certain proposals of social reform on the ground that if carried they will affect the responsibility of the parents and so undermine the vigour of the home life. If, for example, there is a proposal to give meals to hungry children or pensions to the old, or, in short, to do anything that will lessen the burden of existence, at once an outcry is raised on the ground that the family relation will be imperilled. Now if the working classes did not hear this argument, little harm would be done. Unfortunately they do hear it and, paying that uncritical tribute to education habitual among their class, accept the conclusion as correct. But the conclusion fills them with no dismay, and they reply, "Very well, let us injure the family." The family is to them merely an abstract term while the sufferings of the young and

of the old are concrete realities. During the last few years there has been an unmistakable tendency to decry the value of the family. This is due solely to the fact that the working men are continually told that the family is the barrier which bars the road of all possible reform. They are beginning to hate the word, and in hating the word cannot fail to injure the thing signified. If this feeling spreads, as it is spreading under the unwise eloquence of the supporters of the family, we shall inevitably be driven forward to a new state of society in which the family will survive only as an interesting relic of an irrevocable past.

It is not the object of this paper to draw up a detailed scheme of remedies. I have been anxious to show first that, whether judged from the standpoint of society or religion, the family belongs to those institutions which it would be hard, perhaps impossible to replace; and secondly that, amid the stress and strain of modern life, a destructive and wasting disease is fastening on the home, exercising its baneful influence not only in isolated cases, but over wide areas of population. If the disease is to be combated it will not be by a few charitable persons wrestling with a few broken families; we must have the people as a whole thinking out and giving effect to large schemes of salutary reform; in other words we must call in the aid of the State. What small measure of improvement there has been of late years has come to us from that quarter. Sanitary regulations, free education, public parks and municipal control over a few of the necessities of existence,—a few tentative experiments in this direction have justified their adoption by the fruits they have borne. But the larger problems—the fretting burden of the struggle for the bare means of existence, the demoralizing effect of chronic unemployment and sweated wages, the exploitation of child labour in the interests of capital and industrial competition—these remain as yet unsolved. Christianity cannot shelve these questions by ignoring their existence, or it will find itself shelved by being ignored by those who are resolved to discover a remedy. It is idle for religion to tell the poor man that if he were perfectly virtuous he would be perfectly happy, unless at the same time religion makes the first beginnings of virtue possible by insisting on the presence of the first beginnings of a civilization.

[Published for the Pan-Anglican Congress Committees, who alone are responsible for these Papers.]

SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE.

LONDON: NORTHUMBERLAND AVENUE, W.C.

1908.

Being Problems for consideration at the *Pan-Anglican Congress*, 1908.

THE STOCK EXCHANGE AND GAMBLING

SOME people ask whether the Stock Exchange is necessary.

Well, it is the largest commercial body in the world. It is the nerve centre of the politics and finances of nations. It is the barometer of the world's prosperity and adversity. It is an indispensable wheel in the machinery of our commerce. As a body it has largely contributed to the establishment of our great City of London, which is foremost in the world's finance. Without it the Government could not borrow as it does. It could not have raised the millions required for the purposes of the nation in the past. Without it the Water Board could not have taken over the undertakings of the London Water Companies. Any scheme for nationalizing our railway system will depend in large measure on the Stock Exchange.

And now for a little history. Before the establishment of the Stock Exchange, in the seventeenth century, money was hoarded and there was no ready means of investment. But now a new profession sprang into existence. In a certain place in the Royal Exchange there stood among the groups of merchants there assembled a small knot of men who called themselves stock-brokers and stock-jobbers. Their business was in great measure to bring into connexion those who desired to exchange their money for stock and those who desired to exchange their stock for money. Hence the term Stock Exchange, the members of which are divided into two classes :—

1. Brokers.

2. Jobbers.

The business of these two is distinct. The two businesses may not be carried on in partnership, and the existing Rules of the Stock Exchange do not allow any member to act in the dual capacity.

The Broker is employed by the public to buy or sell stocks or shares on their behalf, and in so doing he is paid by a commission or percentage on each transaction.

The Jobber is a dealer in these stocks or shares. He deals directly with the broker, and is not supposed to act as the agent of any outside vendor or purchaser. He depends on the Broker for his business as much as the Barrister depends on the Solicitor for his. The profit consists of the difference

between the buying and the selling price. He buys in the hope of being able to sell at a profit, and he sells in the hope of being able to procure the thing sold for less than the sale price.

In either case, if he does not succeed he has to bear the loss. The jobber performs for the broker directly, and for the broker's principal indirectly, the service of securing a ready market; and as a rule the jobber deals in a particular class of property in respect of which he has a special connexion, but as a rule his business is a speculative one. He is a "bull" when he acts as a potential seller; that is to say, when he buys in the hope of presently selling at a higher figure than that at which he buys. The bull hopes for an elevation. He is a "bear" when he is a potential buyer; that is, when he sells what he does not possess in the hope of presently buying at a lower figure than that at which he sells. The bear chuckles at a depression.

We will now present some explanations and comments on the following transactions:—

I. SALES AND PURCHASES OF PROPERTY NOT IN THE POSSESSION OF THE VENDOR AT THE TIME OF SALE.

It follows from what has been said above that the jobber is every day concerned with dealings in respect of the sales of property not in his own possession at the date of the contract of sale. Such sales must frequently be made by jobbers, and are unavoidable in the ordinary course of a stock-jobbing business.

For example, a stockbroker, who has received instructions from a client to buy £1,000 Great Western Railway ordinary stock, goes into the Home Railway market and asks a jobber the price of Great Westerns. The broker does not say he wants to buy, for that would tempt the jobber to make the price high. The jobber would not, of course, give an out-of-the-way quotation, for the broker knows the market price almost as well as he does. The jobber names two prices, one at which he will sell and one at which he will buy. These prices might be 115-115½, meaning he would buy the stock at 115 or sell it at 115½. The broker then informs the jobber that he buys £1,000 stock from him at 115½. In the course of a few minutes the jobber may have several brokers carrying out similar transactions, and may find that he has sold far more stock than he possesses or can immediately procure. It is quite possible that the jobber would rather have bought; but once having made the prices, he must of course carry

out the transactions. When the broker confronts him, he may say he is only a buyer or only a seller of Great Westerns, but, of course, in refusing to deal both ways, he risks losing the order and to a certain extent his connexion with the broker. This is a simple instance of "sales of stock not in vendor's possession".

This system of dealing (which, however, is by no means confined to transactions on the Stock Exchange) is apt to be abused, and the jobber is tempted to slide from speculation into gambling pure and simple.

It was the popular craze for gambling in stocks and shares which resulted in the South Sea Bubble and the subsequent Resolution of the House of Commons, "That nothing could tend more to the establishment of public credit than to prevent the infamous practice of Stock-Jobbing."

Another flagrant instance of a disaster resulting from a popular craze for gambling in shares is that of "The London and Globe Finance Corporation, Ltd.", where condign punishment was meted out. The Legislature intervened in 1733 with Barnard's Act, which sought to turn all speculative dealings into misdemeanours. It proved abortive, and was repealed in 1860. In 1867 the Legislature was again provoked to intervention, but in the case of one class of property only, in respect of which there is now next to no speculation, viz. Bank Shares. Banks depend on credit for their stability to a greater extent than Consols, Railways, and other property, and the practice of "bearing" the market and speculating for a fall had been carried on to so great an extent as to affect the stability of numbers of shares in Joint Stock Banks. Leeman's Act was passed to prohibit sales of such shares which were not real bona-fide sales of shares actually in the market for disposal.

"Gambling in differences" and "speculating for a rise or a fall" are practices which may tempt those who indulge in them to become in a way freebooters who set to work to depreciate or appreciate the stocks which they profess to sell or buy.

II. DEALINGS WITH BUCKET SHOPS.

"Bucket Shop" is a name given to the office or firm of certain stockbrokers who are outside the Stock Exchange. As a rule no investment business is transacted through Bucket Shops, most of which depend for their profits on the gambling propensities of the public. They are entirely independent of the Stock Exchange and irresponsible. They usually issue their contract notes with a statement inserted that the business is "subject to the Rules and Regulations of the Stock

Exchange", but this is, of course, misleading, as the outside broker cannot be subject in any way to the Stock Exchange. A feature of their trade is advertising, and on the Stock Exchange this is absolutely prohibited. Their advertisements tend to the promotion and encouragement of gambling in stocks and shares, whilst the Press—reaping benefits from the advertisements—does not consistently go out of its way to oppose their demoralizing aims.

In short, Bucket Shops are very often offices kept for betting on the price of securities.

III. DEALINGS IN OPTIONS.

Options, though usually a means of gambling, are not necessarily so. The business of options could not be stopped without seriously handicapping genuine and useful transactions. There are comparatively few dealings in options. Business in options is very intricate and requires a great deal of caution, constant attention, and to a certain extent skill. Buying an option is sometimes useful for securing a profit or guarding against a loss. In buying options, though your loss is limited, your profit is not limited.

Options are of three kinds: (1) The Put, (2) The Call, (3) The Put and Call.

(1) In the case of the Put Option, the operator buys the right to sell so much stock on a certain day at a certain price.
(2) In the case of a Call Option, the operator buys the right to buy so much stock on a certain day at a certain price.
(3) In the case of a double option (i.e. the Put and Call) the operator buys the right either to buy or sell so much stock on a certain day at a certain price.

It is easy to see that Option Dealing may be developed readily into the most intricate combination of transactions. It is also abused by gamblers.

The question of the validity of a "put and call" option has been dealt with in the Courts. The validity depends on the circumstances of each particular case. If it be a contract for good consideration for the right to call for definite shares, it is a perfectly valid transaction and not one in the nature of a bet or a gaming contract. If, however, it be a mere transaction in differences it is invalid at law. Moreover, the Committee of the Stock Exchange would refuse to recognize it as binding under their rules. A transaction, however, may be clothed in legal form and may in form not offend against the Rules of the Stock Exchange. In fact, however, it may be a pretence. In one case (*Sadd v. Foster*, 1897, 13 T.L.R.

207) Lord Esher made some caustic remarks on such a transaction. "It was," he said, "one which consisted in an endeavour to keep up the price of shares, and was not, he thought himself, other than a gambling transaction and one morally unjustifiable. A transaction put into the jargon of the Stock Exchange in order to make it appear a true one." The form alone will not make a transaction valid at law. If it be shown that it was the intention of both sides to make a pretence of the form, the Law will refuse to recognize it. (*Universal Stock Exchange Ltd. v. Strachan*, 1896, *Appeal Cases*, p. 166.)

IV. CARRYING OVER OR CONTINUING AN ACCOUNT.

Probably about four-fifths of these transactions are more or less of a gambling nature, but here again it is very often impossible at the time to distinguish between the false and genuine business. With few exceptions all stocks and shares bought or sold must be paid for at the ordinary settlement, which takes place twice a month. But it would be obviously impossible for every buying or selling transaction to be completed at the stipulated time. For a buyer might be disappointed at not receiving the money he expected to receive in time to pay for the shares he had purchased, and might desire an extension of time till he did receive the money. Bonds or shares, on the other hand, might not be available for delivery from a variety of causes. In fact, so many circumstances might render it desirable for a buyer or seller to postpone his bargain, apart from undue speculation, that continuation or "carrying over" became a necessity, which the Stock Exchange had to recognize. Hence the term *Contango-Day*.

V. DEALINGS ON THE COVER SYSTEM.

There is no space to go fully into "Dealings on the Cover System", with similar transactions. All that can here be said as to them is that they are probably to be regarded as gambling transactions and outside the sphere of genuine business.

REFORM.

What possibilities are there of practical reform with regard to Stock Exchange business from an anti-gambling point of view?

The reformer who is not acquainted very intimately with

the Stock Exchange must not "rush in where angels fear to tread". The Royal Commission of 1877 went at length into the subject of Stock Exchange gambling. As a result the Commission exonerated the Stock Exchange from the charge that it encouraged gambling. It found that it was, as a rule, impossible for members at the time of executing orders to distinguish between those which were gambling and those which were legitimate transactions. The Commissioners did not think it practicable to render gambling business any more illegal than it was already. Those who indulged in it were, they found, mainly the younger and more necessitous members of the Stock Exchange, the Committee of which is always most anxious to do anything practical towards checking gambling. There are many rules which are for the express purpose of putting a stop to various methods of gambling, and every member of the Stock Exchange has annually to sign a declaration that he will conform to the rules of the Committee. It is very exceptional to hear of these rules being broken. To mention one such rule, the Committee strictly order that members must not deal speculatively for employees, but only for principals. Another rule forbids dealing in dividends. Some years ago there was much gambling in transactions of this nature, but it is now non-existent. Any reformer would be welcomed by the Stock Exchange Committee, but he must be prepared to know what he is talking about, and to remember that it is possible to pull up wheat with the tares. He will also find that a high code of business law and almost absolute security and trust prevail in the Stock Exchange, the like of which, perhaps, do not prevail elsewhere in other spheres of commerce. Further, he must remember that laws and rules which cannot be enforced are useless, and in fact do more harm than good. The broker need not even speculate, much less gamble; and while it is conceivable that the time may come when the jobber of the present day is a thing of the past, the London Stock Exchange could not get through the mass of work which it has to do at the present time without him. True, it is a system of speculation, but without speculation commerce and industry would not make the headway which is necessary for the welfare of the world. Speculation is in a sense the fount of experiment and the handmaid of enterprise, and need by no means degenerate into gambling.

SUMMARY.

1. The position of a broker acting for a real principal in respect of a real exchange involving a real transfer and delivery

of property in the market for disposal would appear to be unassailable both from the legal and the moral point of view.

2. The position of a jobber in respect of such a transaction as is specified in (I) *supra* does not offend against the law of the land nor the rules of the Stock Exchange, nor does it appear to offend against morality. The system of remuneration may not be ideal, but neither the broker nor the broker's principal stands to lose by the jobber's gain.

3. The majority of transactions in "Differences" and under the Cover System are mere bets on the market price of property on a future day. They are pure gambling. It is transactions such as these which an eminent judge had in his mind when he said, "I do not like the rules and proceedings upon the Stock Exchange." (Brett, L.J., in *Thacker v. Hardy*, 1878, 4 Queen's Bench Division, p. 693.)

For further reference to Stock Exchange business see in particular *The Stock Exchange*, by Charles Duguid, and *Stock Exchange Accounts*, by Stephen M. Killick. The writer of this paper owes his acknowledgements to these works, as well as to the kind offices of two members of the Stock Exchange.

[Published for the Pan-Anglican Congress Committees, who alone are responsible for these Papers.]

SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE.

LONDON: NORTHUMBERLAND AVENUE, W.C.

1908.

Being Problems for consideration at the *Pan-Anglican Congress*, 1908.

THE HOUSING PROBLEM

BY ALDERMAN W. THOMPSON

THE housing of the working-classes is unquestionably the most important of all the great social questions that are pressing for solution with increasing urgency day by day, and bad housing is beyond doubt a root cause of many other social evils that threaten the basis of society and the healthy integrity of family life. Fifty years ago Charles Dickens said :—" I have systematically tried to turn fiction to the good account of showing the preventable wretchedness and misery in which the masses of the people dwell and of expressing again and again the conviction founded upon observation that *the reform of their habitations must precede all other reforms*, and that without it all other reforms must fail."

Although much improvement has since been effected, new problems have arisen and the necessity for action is as great as ever. Judging, however, by the feeble measures sometimes deemed adequate for solving the housing problem, little will be accomplished until a fuller and clearer conviction prevails generally as to the magnitude of the evil, for except in a few favoured communities it is not merely a question of the poorest poor and the overcrowded slums, but of the moral and physical harm done to millions of families by the nature of their dwellings and their surroundings.

In rural districts the problem is mainly one of bad sanitation, and an insufficient number of bedrooms, aggravated in many cases, strange to say, by a lack of adequate garden space, even where land is comparatively valueless. The physical consequences though often regrettable are not so specially serious in these districts, because the occupations of the people and the plentiful supply of sunlight, fresh air and vegetation round the dwellings if not inside them, go far to strengthen vitality and resisting power to disease. Decency and morality, however, are often made very difficult by the limited accommodation for large and growing families.

The growth of industrialism in many countries, however, has aggravated the housing problem in towns, and perhaps the greatest of our modern difficulties arise from conditions under which millions of our people have left and are leaving the country villages for rapidly-growing urban districts which day by day expand into amorphous ugly overcrowded agglomerations of stone, brick, and mortar, misnamed towns and cities, but more properly deserving in two cases out of three to be condemned almost from boundary to boundary as " insanitary areas ".

The four great faults of the modern city are, first, that there are not a sufficient number of suitable houses for the working class population, second, that the houses are not of good size and quality, or are lacking in cleanliness, light, ventilation, or proper sanitary accommodation, the third is that too many houses are built on a given area, or are badly arranged on such area, and the fourth is that too many people are living in individual houses.

First let it be acknowledged that even three rooms are insufficient to enable proper family life to be maintained in the true sense of the words, and then let us face the fact that more than one half of the whole population of Scotland do not know the decency of even a three-room dwelling. In Scotch towns no less than 280,447 families live in two rooms, in which 883,094 of the occupants, or more than the whole population of New Zealand, are living under conditions of overcrowding ; while 135,684 more families,

numbering 394,000 persons, live in one-room dwellings, where 291,515 persons, or more than the whole population of Western Australia, are returned as overcrowded.

The bad quality of much of the housing accommodation is often as serious as its insufficiency in quantity. According to Sir Walter Foster there are 690,000 houses, or about one-tenth of the total number in England, which are so bad and rotten that they ought to be condemned, but at the present rate of action by local authorities it will take a hundred years to deal with them all, even if no additions to their number take place.

Again, we may have too many houses and therefore too many people per acre, without any overcrowding in the individual houses, but this "overcrowding on area" as it is called, is almost as bad as overcrowding in houses. Sunlight, fresh air and vegetation are absolutely essential to health, yet there are thousands of streets quite removed from the slums, without trees or gardens, where the sun only penetrates on one side if at all, while others are so closely packed with dwellings that the free circulation of air is an utter impossibility.

For instance, the nine most densely populated districts of Glasgow with an average population of 279 per acre had an average mortality of over 27 per thousand, leaping up to 33 and 40 per thousand respectively in districts like Cowcadden and Brownfield, where the population is respectively 296 and 357 per acre, while the nine most sparsely populated districts with an average population of 25 per acre had a mortality of only 15 per thousand, and in West Pollokshields and Kelvinside the death rate was as low as 11 per thousand and 8 per thousand.

It is the combination of overcrowded dwellings, overcrowded land, bad dwellings and bad surroundings that make the insanitary area which we call the slum. Its evils and horrors are familiar to all. But the housing problem is not merely a slum problem—this is only the fringe of it. Thousands of skilled and sober workmen with good jobs cannot get satisfactory houses with proper surroundings at a reasonable rent.

In the cities themselves houses are not often built nowadays for children, though it must be remembered the children will be here when we are gone, and will make the nation of the future. But family life is impossible in the true sense of the word, except in the self-contained dwellings with a garden, and in the near neighbourhood of trees and open spaces.

There is, however, a growing tendency of public opinion in favour of sunlight, fresh air, and green fields. Public-spirited and far-seeing employers of labour are building their factories in the country; while others, like Lever Bros. at Port Sunlight and Mr. Cadbury at Bournville, are trying to bring the country to the town by creating sanitary and beautiful homes for the working-classes in what are fitly called garden villages. The results are that, at Bournville, for the four years ended 1905, the average death rate was only 7.3 per 1,000, as against 19.3 per 1,000 for the adjoining city of Birmingham; while the infant mortality rate was only 72.5 per 1,000 births, as against 331 per 1,000 for the area clustered round the Church of the Madonna in the parish of St. Mary's, Birmingham.

In this connexion, it may be pointed out that in British colonies we get these average death rates:—New Zealand 9.5, Queensland 10.1, South Australia 10.2, and New South Wales 10.6; with infant mortality as follows:—South Australia 70, New Zealand 71, Queensland 76, Victoria 78, and New South Wales 82. Hence we may reasonably assume that a general death rate of 10 per 1,000, and an infant mortality rate of 80 deaths per 1,000 births, constitute a standard to which most communities could reasonably attain if their housing conditions were satisfactory.

The following areas or groups of areas or countries have each about the

same population, namely, 4,500,000, but the deaths varied in 1904 as follows :—

	<i>Population</i>	<i>Total Deaths</i>	<i>Phthisis Deaths</i>	<i>Infant Mortality per 1,000 Births</i>
Australasian Colonies. .	4,799,105	51,600	4,146	80
English Rural Counties .	4,327,835	58,425	5,070	117
London	4,536,063	75,558	7,478	146
Scotland	4,627,656	77,961	6,630	120
Lancashire	4,437,398	86,518	6,300	176

Thus we see that as compared with the Australasian colonies, the excess deaths in one year (1904) in the other areas were as follows :—London 23,958, Scotland 26,361, and Lancashire 34,918, while the excessive deaths from phthisis in these areas were nearly 8,000, and the infant mortality from 50 to 120 per cent. greater. When we remember that the total deaths in the British army in the South African War from all causes were 21,944, we get a clear idea of the annual holocaust accepted by many public men as a normal feature in the national life.

The direct connexion between housing conditions and death rates can be clearly seen from the following figures from Sir Shirley Murphy's presidential address to the Society of Medical Officers of Health in 1906, which show how the general death rates, phthisis death rates, and infant mortality rates in six districts in London vary mathematically with varying degrees of overcrowding as under :—

	<i>Percentage of Overcrowding</i>	<i>General Death Rate</i>	<i>Phthisis Death Rate</i>	<i>Infant Mortality Rate per 1,000 Births</i>
Under 10 per cent.		14.5	1.26	142
10 to 15 per cent.		16.2	1.52	180
15 „ 20 „		18.1	1.64	196
20 „ 25 „		19.0	2.06	193
25 „ 30 „		20.9	2.27	210
30 „ 35 „		21.0	2.13	222

The following comparisons between four counties in England tell their own tale as to the effect of overcrowding not only on death rates, but also on intemperance as shown by the marked correspondence between cases of overcrowding and convictions for drunkenness :—

	<i>Population</i>	<i>Persons Overcrowded</i>	<i>Total Deaths</i>	<i>Infant Mortality</i>	<i>Convictions for Drunkenness</i>
Northumberland	602,859	32.0	10,997	152	170.1
Sussex	605,763	1.5	7,925	95	30.9
Excessive Deaths in Northumberland			3,072	57 per 1,000 Births	
Durham	1,194,442	28.4	21,962	156	115.5
Essex	1,052,452	2.7	14,913	115	29.5
Excessive Deaths in Durham			7,049	41 per 1,000 Births	

These are mining counties, but it will be noticed that the deaths are of children destroyed in the dwellings, rather than of men in the mines. Indeed the number of excess deaths in one year is greater than that of all the lives that have been lost through all the colliery explosions and accidents in a generation.

In England as a whole, out of 944,703 infants born in 1904 no less than 137,490 died within twelve months. Hence, in view of the foregoing figures, we may say that at least 52,000 infants, or 1,000 per week, were unnecessarily sacrificed, and indeed are being sacrificed this very year.

Although the foregoing facts and figures relate mainly to Great Britain,

the evils are as a rule worse in all the older countries, and nearly as bad in some of the newer ones. In Berlin more than half the families (comprising nearly 1,000,000 persons) live in one room, or one room and a *zube-bör*—a kind of kitchen scullery. More than 2,000 of these take in lodgers, and there are some 24,088 cellar dwellings, sheltering 91,426 persons or one in twenty of the population.

New York has 82,000 tenement houses, with no less than 350,000 dark interior rooms without any light whatsoever. The "double-deckers" or "dumb-bell" tenements are buildings five, six, or seven stories high, built adjoining each other on a plot of land about 25 feet wide and 100 feet deep, of which the building covers over 75 per cent., leaving the small space of 10 feet unoccupied in the rear. In the centre of each tenement is an entrance hall, and a long corridor about three feet wide, badly lighted and ventilated, with seven rooms on either side; and of the fourteen rooms on each floor, only four receive direct light and air. The other five rooms on either side are supposed to get their light and air from a high narrow shaft entirely enclosed on four sides and without any intake of air at the bottom, so that instead of fresh air and sunshine they get foul air and semi-darkness, while the shafts act as conveyers of noise, odours and disease due to the emanations from the other families. To this may be added the fact that a family living in a double-decker tenement pays from 12/- to 18/- a week for four rooms, only two of which are large enough to be deserving of the name.

Just as the foregoing facts and figures amply prove the destructive effects of bad environment on the lives of little children, so the blighting of the bodies of the survivors is fully demonstrated by the comparison of the physique of children in different districts. Bournville boys are on the average four inches taller and three inches bigger round the chest than poor boys in Birmingham. Boys of fourteen in the elementary school in the Garden Village of Port Sunlight are from two to six inches taller, and from fourteen to thirty-six pounds heavier according to the class of their parents, than the boys attending the elementary schools of Liverpool. In these and several other cases, the difference was not to be accounted for by better feeding.

No less than 139,447 cases of infectious disease were notified last year among half the population of England, and these cases were four times more numerous in overcrowded districts than elsewhere. In Glasgow 72 per cent. of the removals to the hospitals for infectious disease in one year came from the one-room and two-room houses.

To-day in England the difficult task of dealing with intemperance is causing the greatest excitement in parliament, in the press and among the great body of citizens, but temperance reformers nearly always overlook the fact that among the working-classes drink is mainly a consequence of overcrowding and environment. The licensing statistics for 1907 show us that the convictions for drunkenness in counties and towns vary in the main according to the density of the population crowded on a given area, and we find that the most overcrowded counties like Northumberland, Durham, London and Glamorganshire are at the top of the list in respect of convictions for drunkenness.

Unemployment and poverty follow closely on the heels of spells of illness and lowered vitality. The slums make many unemployable. In the analysis of the causes of poverty, emphasis has been placed unduly upon personal causes such as intemperance, shiftlessness and inefficiency; but economists now recognize the primary causes that lie in environment.

So much for some of the more striking and obvious evils arising from bad housing conditions. Now let us consider remedies. Those who have

given the most careful study to the problem agree that as desperate diseases are said to require desperate remedies, so big evils such as those of bad housing and overcrowding must be removed by large measures generously conceived and vigorously executed.

We shall not find in any one remedy a "Morison's Pill" to cure all the evils of bad housing conditions. We must not make a fetish or a bug-bear either of municipal housing or of private enterprise; but we must recognize that a question so vast and many-sided requires for its solution not one but many agencies and remedies, although the primary responsibility must rest upon the State and local authorities.

One of the best works any voluntary association can do is to stimulate municipal bodies to do their duty with regard to the housing of the people by rousing public opinion, so as to secure the removal of the obstacles that stand in the way of reform. These obstacles are generally agreed to be the strength of vested interests in opposing the proper enforcement of the sanitary and housing laws by the local authorities, and the imperfect character of those laws, which renders their working difficult, costly and slow. It is no exaggeration to say that a strict administration of the sanitary and housing Acts under present conditions would mean municipal extinction to thousands of public representatives and professional disaster to hundreds of public servants. Members would lose their seats; while medical officers of health, sanitary inspectors and building surveyors would often lose their salaries, if not their posts.

The intelligence of the working-classes has never been properly awakened as to the supreme importance of the question, and it may be questioned if one workman in a thousand knows the foregoing facts and figures or realizes their full significance. Indeed the enforcement of the sanitary law so injuriously affects the workman under present conditions that only too frequently he dreads the visits of the sanitary inspector more than the slum owner himself does, because owing to the scarcity of suitable dwellings it means either being turned out of his house without any prospect of getting as good a house for the same money elsewhere, or it means paying an excessively disproportionate increased rent in respect of any large outlay made by his landlord on sanitary improvements. It is this difficulty in supplying new accommodation at a rent which the tenant can reasonably be expected to be able to pay which governs the whole situation, and paralyses many schemes, efforts and methods that might otherwise effect a vast amount of good.

If there were in every district a sufficient number of healthy houses at reasonable rents, the tenants of bad houses could quickly be forced out of them into the new dwellings. Thus grade by grade, the whole housing conditions of the locality would be raised, and the very worst slums would be left untenanted, or, at any rate, less crowded than they are at present. Unfortunately, this constructive work—the most essential part of all—has been more neglected than any other part. Owing to the lack of co-operation and co-ordination between public and private enterprise we have been left with a deficient supply, with the old slums and with acres and acres of new slums in the suburbs. Where the new houses are well built and on good sites the rents are so unreasonably high as to be beyond the means of one family, so they have to be sublet to other families, and thus by overcrowding, with the increased wear and tear following in its train, they rapidly deteriorate, and leave the housing of the mass of the people as bad in many respects as it was before. Private enterprise has also been handicapped severely in obtaining cheap land for workmen's dwellings, and much of the inferior housing accommodation recently provided is due to the conditions of sale or lease being so oppressive and exacting as to compel the builder to spoil

the sanitary condition of his houses in order to make both ends meet, or to build a type of house quite unsuited for the working-classes. All the various agencies—religious, philanthropic, and commercial—that might be tempted to build good dwellings, need land and municipal organization, with new transit facilities as the concomitants to any successful work on a large scale. The local authorities are the only bodies entrusted with compulsory powers of land purchase for the purpose of providing sites for workmen's dwellings, and it is plain that we must look to them, in most cases at any rate, for the initiative in effective efforts to secure the great quantity of new and healthy house-room required to cope with the house famine.

Municipal bodies, and to some extent private companies and individuals carrying out housing schemes, have had to pay too much for land, too much for road and sewer making, too much for building, too high a rate of interest for money, too large instalment for sinking funds, and too much for taxes on dwellings, most of them being matters within the power of the legislature to improve.

Experiments, such as Garden City, Bourneville, Hampstead Garden Suburb, Earswick, Port Sunlight, and the Small Holdings Act passed by Parliament in 1907 are all practical attempts to embody various forms of the idea agitating the minds of leading housing reformers in England to-day, viz., how best to establish, regulate and encourage a proper system of town and village development which shall provide for the organized dispersion of the population of overcrowded centres from the dear land to the cheap land. People should be encouraged to move in the first stage to residential suburbs, such as Hampstead, Ealing, and Sheffield (Wincobank), or, in the second stage to industrial villages quite detached from the main centre, such as Bourneville and Port Sunlight, or, in the third stage, to the rural districts which need colonization by the development of an improved system of land cultivation, and the re-establishment of rural industries.

The great advances that are being made in the transmission of electric power, enabling industries to be carried on at a distance from the centre, with the cheapening and improvement of means of transit for both goods and passengers, are such that it will be possible to destroy the obstacles of time and distance which at present, though to a less extent than formerly, render it necessary to crowd factories together in certain areas, surrounded by an unduly concentrated population.

Town-planning powers should certainly be conferred upon local authorities, so that adequate control and foresight may be exercised in the interests of the community over the laying out of new building areas, so as to prevent the growth of new slum areas by the overcrowding of houses on land and especially to enable the local authority to acquire the necessary land for sites for public buildings, working-class dwellings, streets and open spaces of all kinds at or near its agricultural or other non-developed value.

Municipal land-purchase is most essential, because although much evil has been prevented in continental cities, and notably in Germany, by conferring great powers of regulation on the local authorities in the foregoing respects, our political system and our national character will not readily admit of adequate powers being exercised over individual estates by a person or authority other than the owner of the land; and even in Germany the town-planning powers are not successful in securing the erection of suitable and sufficient dwellings for the working-classes except in some of those towns where municipal land-purchase on a large scale has prevailed.

Cheaper roads may be expected from improved town-planning, and site-planning with a system of street by-laws and building regulations, based on the substitution of air space between the houses for unnecessary widths

of macadam. Garden City and the Hampstead Garden Suburb are being developed on these lines already.

Cheap building depends largely upon land being cheap enough to permit of the erection of buildings of the cottage type instead of costly block dwellings. In England the average cost of block dwellings is £90 per room, or 9d. per foot cube, as against £45 per room, or 4½d. per foot cube for cottages. This difference in building cost alone is more than would be needed to pay for the whole cost of establishing and running *free tramways* for every occupier of such dwellings erected in the suburbs.

Let us hope in the near future to re-model our towns, and substitute horizontal expansion with cottages and gardens served by electric tramways, for vertical extension with badly ventilated or comparatively sunless block dwellings. At the same time a reduction of cost can be secured by simplifications of building by-laws, and production on a large scale, based upon a system of standardization of the parts of the house, and adoption of new materials and economical designs.

There is also great need to secure that in all rural districts plenty of land should be attached to all cottages either in the shape of a large garden or a small holding, according to local circumstances, so that the rent of the house may be wholly or partly met by the produce of the land. At Bournville, an average profit of 1s. 10½d. per week has been obtained from plots of about one-eighth of an acre, and experience in all countries shows that between this limit and that of a small holding of fifty acres there are all sorts of possible and profitable combinations of land with the dwelling-houses.

Cheap money, and the improved organization of credit for building purposes, so as to encourage the provision of adequate financial support for municipalities as well as for societies and individuals building cheap and suitable working-class dwellings in public land are absolutely necessary, if the very poor are to be satisfactorily housed at rents they may be reasonably expected to pay. In Ireland and Belgium cheap money has already been voted for this purpose, and the example should be followed in other countries.

Although housing reform cannot be effected without the expenditure of money, it cannot be too strongly emphasized that it is far more expensive to allow things to go on as they are. The truth is that whether considered as to health, life, or the money standard, housing reform makes for economy.

The ratepayers of England have expended some £40,000,000 in outstanding loans for cemeteries, hospitals, lunatic asylums, workhouses and slum-buying, besides an expenditure of £14,781,170 in one year out of rates for these purposes. The fourteen largest friendly societies with 3,342,253 members spent £3,245,328 in one year (1904) on sick and funeral benefits alone—nearly £1 per member. In the ten years 1892–1901 the one hundred principal trades unions spent over £2,500,000 on sick pay alone.

The inclusive recorded expenditure of all the charitable societies in England for one year on asylums, convalescent homes, dispensaries, reformatory schools, spiritual institutions, and relief amount to no less than £15,269,890.

During the last twenty-five years the Church of England has spent from the voluntary contributions of its members alone £21,362,041 in attempts to educate the people at home, £7,421,478 on home missions to the same people when grown up, £4,877,701 for hospitals, infirmaries, institutes, and charitable works, in addition to over £25,000,000 on church-building, and £2,500,000 on housing the clergy. Incidentally it may be pointed out that this last named sum is more than all the provincial municipalities in the country have spent under Part III of the Housing of the Working-Classes Act in building houses for the poor.

The above figures make up a total of £145,000,000, and as at least one-

third of the deaths in England were due to preventable causes arising from bad housing conditions, we may safely assume that one-third of the sickness, disease, and other evils, physical, moral, and intellectual, were similarly preventable, and that with improved housing conditions at least one-third of the above-mentioned expenditure could have been reduced, and that it can be diminished in the future or made one third more effective.

But the best of laws are useless, without the knowledge and public spirit that will secure their effective administration. In order to set in motion machinery of the necessary magnitude and power for effecting drastic reform, we must seek for a powerful impulse from public opinion, which can only be effectively stirred by complete knowledge of the facts. Hence the need for the inspection of every dwelling, and the establishment of a register of dwellings to record full particulars as to their size and sanitary condition, with the names of their owners. Given this information, followed by an examination of its details, and the publication of its main facts and figures, we should have in every country a sanitary revolution. Nothing is dreaded more by the opponents of housing reform than such a record of existing conditions and the names of those immediately responsible, but without the exact knowledge to be derived in this manner, it will be next to impossible to devise appropriate remedies and secure the driving force to overcome these obstacles to their application.

Even with full knowledge, however, some great moral impulse is required to overcome the material forces of greed and self-interest, or the prejudices and apathy of those who have tolerated this condition of things for so long.

We must face the fundamental fact that a dwelling which means death to the tenant often means money gain to the owner. It is human life against moneyed interest, not of the well-to-do alone, but of comparatively poor persons who have invested in inferior cottage property. The tragedy is that too often the bread and butter of one widow, the rent gatherer, depends on the making of other widows by taking money from men's families for death-dealing dwellings.

For the evil conditions and surroundings under which human life in this country has been allowed to develop during the last hundred years of industrialism we cannot hold the Church of England blameless. How far has she protested against this state of things? We all know that in the past she has often been ready to accept it as necessary. Had she used her great influence consistently to battle with these evils, there is little doubt that they would never have grown as they have done. But the Church, no less than the world, is passing out of a period of somewhat irresponsible individualism, and now that a spirit of solidarity and brotherhood is beginning to make itself felt in our national life, the question for Churchmen is how far shall this spirit be moulded and permeated by the Church or allowed to develop independently, and to look on the Church as an alien force? To a large extent this is what has happened to-day. It is essential that the Church should rise to its responsibilities, and prove that Christianity is the mainspring and the guide of that new spirit. Here in England we have much to undo, as well as much to do. In Canada, Africa, and Australia, there are the still greater opportunities that are given by new countries. Will the Church see to it that the new countries do not reproduce the evils of the old, but that as their towns grow up and their fields are tilled, the people shall be free at least from the grosser evils of industrial civilization?

[Published for the Pan-Anglican Congress Committees, who alone are responsible for these Papers.]

S.P.C.K., LONDON : NORTHUMBERLAND AVENUE, W.C.

1908.

PAN-ANGLICAN PAPERS

Being Problems for consideration at the *Pan-Anglican Congress*, 1908.

RURAL HOUSING

By MISS CONSTANCE COCHRANE

THE Housing Question is now almost universally admitted to lie at the root of every other social problem. In the home the character is first influenced for good or evil, and the higher instincts are either developed or crushed. As plants thrive and grow only in genial soil, so the flowers of health, prosperity, and self-respect will only thrive and grow where the conditions are favourable. It is true that occasionally a vigorous plant may expand in spite of adverse conditions, and the same may be granted for the human plant, but such exceptions are rare.

The conditions of rural housing and sanitation in England, as they affect the health, prospects, and right independence of the agricultural labourer, are at the present time far from satisfactory. Cottages are scarce, crowded, and insanitary; frequently very damp and without any wholesome water-supply—often without any supply at all. It is sometimes impossible to obtain milk in villages, and proper supervision of the small dairies is practically non-existent.

The question of the unemployed is largely complicated by the influx to the towns of the best of the young country labourers, many of whom are driven away by want of homes, more by want of prospect, and some by want of work. At about twenty years of age the majority of agricultural labourers are receiving the highest wage to which they will ever attain. Handicapped by the ordinary vicissitudes of life, few are able to do more than provide for sickness and burial by joining some benefit society. These societies are too often merely local, and fail to meet their liabilities when called upon.

In spite of great improvement in its management, there is still, happily, a strong feeling against looking upon the Workhouse as a final home. And yet for many a widow and aged labourer there is no other prospect, for even when their relatives are able and willing to support them their homes are needed for workers.

The rural housing question is so complicated by reason of its intimate connexion with other social questions that the causes for the present unsatisfactory conditions can be but barely touched upon in a short paper such as this. No social problem can be treated by itself, nor by one or even several measures. All are parts of one great whole, of which the dominant and abiding factor is the individual. It is the short-sighted selfishness of the individual in the past, and his failure to realize his personal responsibility as to character and conduct, that have resulted in the dislocation of society, and brought the rural housing question, amongst others, into the prominence for which its unhappy condition is responsible.

All selfishness is self-destructive, given sufficient time for Nemesis to accomplish its end. Even from the worldly point of view, does it demonstrate a wise foresight to maintain that true business principles consist in extorting the utmost profit from an undertaking? Will not such action result in the incurring of indirect liabilities, which will probably more than counteract the extra profit extorted?

The depopulation of the rural districts to-day has been largely caused by the divorce of the labourer from the soil, also to some extent

by the introduction of machinery, and the laying down of arable land to grass. At the time when agriculture was flourishing, a number of small holdings were absorbed into large farms, in order to increase the profits of the richer man. More recently, when the evil results of this policy became recognized, the movement in favour of restoring a certain number of small holdings has been hindered by the difficulties and cost of severance and equipment. The most enterprising of the village population, unable to follow their natural occupation of cultivating the land with the hope of improving their position, have been forced into competing in the already congested labour market of the towns. In the villages the results are disastrous in many ways: depression becomes general, local trade suffers, and dullness pervades the district. The food-supply grows less, and, according to Mr. Rider Haggard, "Two-thirds of the productiveness of the soil runs to waste, large tracts of land which should be cultivated being turned into sporting estates".

Should a disease break out among cattle, incurring loss to the owner, every effort is made and no expense is spared to stamp it out; but if chronic illness, and even death, occurs as the result of living in an unhealthy home, or if immorality of the worst kind is fostered owing to inadequate sleeping accommodation, frequently no effort is made to alter the conditions responsible for these evils, and the argument that cottage property does not pay is considered sufficient to exonerate the owner from any blame in the matter. It is not realized that even the material cost of such results is actually greater than in the case of cattle, since it is only felt indirectly in the form of a higher poor rate, and the general expenses of hospitals, asylums, orphanages, prisons, and homes for the feeble-minded.

When agriculture was more prosperous in this country, the land-owner looked upon the cottage as part of the equipment of the farm, but now that the cultivation of the land will not admit of the four profits of the land-owner, land-agent, farmer and labourer, it is considered that cottages ought to help to make up the deficiency by yielding a return. As cottages are never let at a commercial rent, they may still be considered as forming part of the wages.

In the open villages the position is different. These consist mainly of very poor cottages owned by small local speculators who are often at a loss how to invest their little savings, and can see an immediate return in the rent of a cottage. Many of these are occupied by farm labourers working for corporate or individual land-owners who are without sufficient cottages of their own, but many more are the refuge of the widow, the single woman, and the old couple. To a large extent this property is in an extremely dilapidated condition and is rapidly disappearing, often at the rate of one house every year, and in many villages no others are built to take their place.

Although rents are generally rather higher than in the close villages, they are still too low to admit of the necessary repairs, which might often lengthen the life of the cottage. In this way the effect of the Truck System, in regard to cottages, completely frustrates any attempt to meet the demand by building.

Thus, although in populous districts in the home counties and the suburbs of towns, it is mainly the land question which prevents cottage building, in remote rural districts, given the land for nothing, still a labourer's cottage cannot be built to let at the customary rent.

At the lowest estimate a pair of brick cottages with three bedrooms and two living rooms cannot be built for less than £300. For the sake

of argument, we will allow a small fence, and woodshed, and a well for the joint use of the two cottages (though it is very doubtful if this could be done). Allowing 5 per cent. interest on the £300, a few shillings for depreciation, and the usual amount for rates and insurance, the cottages cannot be let for less than £10 a year each, which is more than double the rent paid for the older cottages, and just double that paid for the new ones. These remarks apply to the majority of the remote and purely agricultural districts, and the figures show that the demand cannot be met by the ordinary builder.

It would be of some assistance if in every fair-sized village a few cottages were built for those in a position to pay a commercial rent. The smaller vacated cottage could then be occupied by the labourer.

The provision of large gardens would also enable a higher rent to be paid, and would obviate the necessity for drainage—one of the most costly and unsatisfactory necessities of village life when houses are crowded together without gardens.

It is to be regretted that so much prejudice exists in favour of the almost exclusive use of brick for cottage building. If the materials found in the district could more frequently be utilized they would often be both less expensive and more pleasing to the eye. For instance, nothing can be more comfortable, warm in winter and cool in summer, than a cottage of "mud and stud" with a thatched roof. The reason why the old cottages of this kind are objectionable is that they entirely lack damp-courses, proper foundations, and sufficient window space. (Where rain-water has to be carefully collected from the roof, thatch is of course undesirable.)

At Winterslow, near Salisbury, where small freeholders have built between thirty and forty of their own houses, a builder specially skilled in the use of local material can erect a good five-roomed cottage for £115, out of the chalk dug from the site. In this way the houses have both cellars and water tanks, the separate cost of the latter consisting only of the lining tiles and cement. If encouragement is to be given to the use of local materials, a revision of by-laws will be necessary in some localities.

In many instances village tradesmen and others would be glad to build their own cottages if they could obtain land at a reasonable price and in a convenient situation.

The soundest solution of the rent difficulty would be the raising of wages to a figure which would cover a commercial rent. This could be achieved by a readjustment all round, but might be somewhat difficult to accomplish, for unless widely adopted it would not work. The labourer should rent directly from the owner at a commercial rent. The farmer should pay to the labourer the extra wage to allow of this; and the owner should deduct the same amount from the rent of the farm. In this way, although the owner would receive less rent for his farms, the equivalent would be paid by the cottagers. The value of this solution would be the immediate bringing into the market in the ordinary way of a large number of cottages.

So far one of the most important factors bearing upon rural housing and sanitation has not been touched upon, namely the question of local government and administration. The local authority (Rural District Council) appointed to deal with all matters connected with health, housing, water-supply, and the Poor Law, consists of one or more elected representatives from each parish in the district, which may comprise small or very large areas, varying from one to over sixty parishes. This body, the members of which are elected every

three years, meets usually every fortnight, sometimes once a month. The appointment of a Medical Officer of Health, Surveyor, Inspector of Nuisances, and Relieving Officer, is compulsory upon all Councils. Each parish has also its Council or Meeting, and may make representation to the County Council or Rural District Council as to allotments, small holdings, building schemes, water-supply, and other health matters.

The County Council is the largest local body, its area usually comprising that of the county. This council is composed of one or more members from each rural district. The County Council has large powers in dealing with education, building schemes, small holdings, &c., and may appoint a Medical Officer of Health for the county; but up to the present time barely half the counties in England have availed themselves of this power.

At first sight it would appear that ample provision has been made for a complete and satisfactory scheme of Local Government. After a trial of some fifteen to twenty years, however, the results have been far from satisfactory. Though we have to acknowledge here again that the fault lies rather with the individual, with whom rests the carrying out of the work, than with the scheme, there are certain defects in the scheme itself which are obvious to an impartial observer. One of the most important of these consists of the terms of appointment of the rural Health Officers. The usual custom for the Medical Officer to hold his post subject to annual reappointment by the local Council is disastrous to the interests of public health. A large number of Health Officers derive their income principally from private practice, and when it is considered that in the conscientious discharge of their duties they frequently have to report unfavourably, not only on the properties of their patients, but on that owned by one or other member of the Council, in whose hands their reappointment rests, it will be readily understood that the number of men who can successfully face these difficulties, without losing their posts, is extremely small. Again and again has it happened that an officer has lost his appointment through the conscientious carrying out of his duty. The stamp of men willing to hold such a position is in consequence rapidly deteriorating, and no special knowledge of sanitation or health matters is thought necessary, when the only way for the officer to be sure of keeping his appointment is by doing as little as possible.

The same thing holds good with the rural Inspectors of Nuisances. At the present time no certificate of sanitary knowledge is legally required for these officers; consequently, though every year a large number of men and women go through a course of training in sanitary matters in order to fit them for such work, the Councils frequently fix their choice on an untrained man, who they think will be less alive to the sanitary needs of the district. One of the most important duties of the rural Health Officers is the house-to-house visitation of their district, as, without such systematic inspection, its true condition cannot be known. Although this duty is strictly laid down by the regulations of the Local Government Board, it is almost universally disregarded. The need for reform in this respect has been emphasized in the following words by Mr. Wilson Fox:—

“I venture to reiterate that until the inspection of cottages is undertaken by the County Councils, or a Government Office, through capable and disinterested officials, influenced by no local prejudices or interests, so long will the housing of the labourers remain a great blot on our rural life.”

Here, then, two reforms are distinctly needed.

1. Proof of some certificate or diploma of sanitary knowledge should be made compulsory for both Medical Officers of Health and Inspectors of Nuisances.

2. The whole conduct of the Health Service should be in the hands of a wider, more impartial, and more responsible authority.

Although on many Rural District Councils throughout the country there are a certain number of public-spirited men and women, whose sole aim is to serve the community, and who, in spite of difficulty and opposition, have here and there succeeded in carrying out some reforms, the efforts of many more have been entirely frustrated by the dead weight of ignorance and indifference, or by the active opposition of those whose sole object is to protect or benefit their own pockets.

Within the last few years the Local Government Board have held a large number of inquiries in rural districts, and the most conspicuous features to be found in the reports of the districts inspected has been neglect and maladministration on the part of the sanitary authorities. The evidence laid before the Select Committee on Rural Housing, presided over by Sir John Dickson-Poynder in 1906, all goes to prove this point, and entirely justifies the recommendation made by that Committee that the administration of the Public Health and Housing of the Working Classes Acts should be transferred to a wider authority.

Although there is no justification for the attitude of the majority of rural sanitary authorities, it must be borne in mind that the districts they administer are often very poor, and necessary schemes of water-supply and housing cannot be carried out on that account. For this reason also the administration should be in the hands of a wider authority, and the cost spread over a larger area.

The question of water-supply is a very serious one in many rural districts, and the present law affecting it is far from satisfactory, partly because it was framed principally for towns. Also under existing administration unfair advantage is taken of its necessary indefiniteness.

As exemplifying one of the chief defects in the existing law, the following instance is one in which the Rural Housing and Sanitation Association was asked to render assistance:—

“Nine cottages depend for their supply of drinking water on a pond fed by the surface drainage of ploughed fields and a ditch. Close by, and within a few yards of the ditch, is a sanitary convenience used by sixteen or more persons, which after heavy rain overflows into the ditch, and the contents of the cesspit, when it is emptied, perhaps once in each year, are thrown on the surrounding ground, whence much must be washed into the pond. The surface of the pond is covered with a thick green scum, and the water is dark and muddy. The cottagers always have to strain it and let it stand for some hours to clear further, and it is always full of animalculæ. Twenty-three people use this water, and the children are constantly suffering from sore throat and diarrhoea, &c.”

According to the present law a supply of water could be enforced, provided the cost for each cottage did not exceed £6 or £8. This for the nine cottages would amount to £54 or £72—but, though one well could be dug to supply the group of nine cottages for about £25, there is no power to compel this to be done. It will be readily understood that £6 or £8 is an insufficient sum to provide a water-supply to a house, except where water is laid on as in a town; there is therefore nothing to be done but to close the cottages as unfit for habitation, or to leave the inhabitants to their polluted water and consequent ill health.

The further establishment of small holdings, which recent legislation has done so much to encourage and promote, ought to do a great deal towards bringing back prosperity to the rural districts, if the holdings are also supplied with cottages. It is to be hoped that care will be taken to establish on the land those who have learnt by experience how to cultivate it successfully. It is also essential that small holdings shall be worked on co-operative principles, and that there should be in connexion with them a reserve fund or agricultural bank.

The settling of workers upon the land in a more independent position will, in all probability, help to restore the interest, which is fast dying out, in such skilled labour as thatching, hedging and ditching, draining, making hayricks, &c. By offering them better prospects it may reasonably be expected that more zeal and intelligence will be introduced into farming by the young labourers, who would prefer a country life if it gave them sufficient scope for their energy and personal effort.

With the promotion of small holdings the necessity for agricultural education is increased. The principles underlying the sciences of agriculture and horticulture must be taught and practically demonstrated in schools and school gardens. Pamphlets should be circulated, and village lectures given on poultry-rearing, bee-keeping, pig-keeping, the management of stock, on soils and manures, on fruit culture, and on modern methods of land cultivation. In these days of severe competition no effort must be spared if successful results are to be secured.

In an old country like England the best has often to be made of adverse conditions which have been allowed gradually to grow up, but in a new country, or in developing a new village, the lessons of past experience can be borne in mind, and evils which are so hard to cure may be prevented from arising.

We have noticed defects in existing legislation, in municipal administration, and in the action of individual owners, which have all contributed to increase the difficulties of the problem which England has to face. It is clear, therefore, that if the present unsatisfactory conditions here are to be remedied, and the like avoided in new countries, the legislative bodies, the local authorities, the owners, occupiers, and the general public must all combine in united effort. In introducing or amending legislation, expert opinion should be consulted, and the laws should be framed in the interests of the whole community, without favour to any special class.

Members of municipalities should realize that careful study and a practical apprenticeship are as essential for efficient work on public bodies as they are in any other calling.

The owner should recognize that all property is of the nature of a trust, and that he is personally responsible for the proper condition of his houses, and for their suitability for the families occupying them. If a house, fit only for a small family, is occupied by a number so large that they cannot live decently, the owner is unquestionably responsible, and ignorance of the fact is no excuse.

The tenant must do his share by keeping the house and surroundings in a clean and healthy condition, by the punctual payment of rent, and by observing regulations framed to prevent overcrowding and the spread of illness.

The general public have an important part to play. Public opinion is one of the most powerful forces for good or evil in any community. The wrongs which now exist would in many cases never have arisen but for the apathy of the nation in general. When once the voice of public opinion is raised in protest against any abuse, it will not be long

before that abuse begins to disappear. Without an enlightened public opinion the best law remains a dead-letter, and the best thought-out scheme of local government proves a failure.

It is the part, then, of individual citizens first to consider and study these questions, and having discovered the practical remedies, to leave no stone unturned to ensure their speedy application.

In the past the Christian Church has used its enormous influence to combat the special sins peculiar to each succeeding age. That influence has now to be brought to bear upon one of the greatest dangers of the present time. The love of luxury runs through every class of society, and leads to unjust, if not actually dishonest, ways of getting money. Not only in the matter of rural housing, but in many other social questions, the results of a policy of greed and selfishness are becoming evident to all. In every class the absorbing desire to gain and to keep is deadening the consciences of men and women to the perception of higher things. It is the part of the Christian Church to attack the evil at its root, and to lead men to a greater simplicity of life and a deeper sense of brotherhood.

AVERAGE EARNINGS OF AGRICULTURAL LABOURERS IN ENGLAND, FROM THE SECOND REPORT BY MR. WILSON FOX, CONTROLLER-GENERAL OF THE LABOUR DEPARTMENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE.

County.	Average weekly rates of cash wages paid throughout the year.	Average weekly earnings (including the value of allowances in kind).	Excess of earnings over cash wages.
NORTHERN COUNTIES :			
	s. d.	s. d.	s. d.
Northumberland	19 4	21 7	2 3
Durham	20 0	22 2	2 2
Cumberland and Westmorland	18 4	20 0	1 8
Lancashire	18 10	20 7	1 9
Yorkshire, East Riding	16 9	19 2	2 5
Yorkshire, North Riding	16 9	18 10	2 1
Yorkshire, West Riding	17 3	19 10	2 7
MIDLAND COUNTIES :			
Derbyshire	18 8	20 7	1 11
Cheshire	17 0	18 9	1 9
Nottinghamshire	17 3	19 9	2 6
Leicestershire and Rutland	15 9	17 4	1 7
Staffordshire	15 11	18 4	2 5
Shropshire	14 8	18 0	3 4
Worcestershire	14 2	16 5	2 3
Warwickshire	14 4	16 4	2 0
Oxfordshire	12 0	14 6	2 6
Northamptonshire	14 1	16 2	2 1
Buckinghamshire	14 8	16 4	1 8
Middlesex	17 10	20 4	2 6
Hertfordshire	14 8	17 2	2 6
Bedfordshire	13 6	16 6	3 0

AVERAGE EARNINGS OF AGRICULTURAL LABOURERS (*continued*):—

County.	Average weekly rates of cash wages paid throughout the year.		Average weekly earnings (including the value of allowances in kind).		Excess of earnings over cash wages.	
	s.	d.	s.	d.	s.	d.
EASTERN COUNTIES :						
Huntingdonshire	13	8	16	2	2	6
Cambridgeshire	12	8	16	1	3	5
Lincolnshire	15	6	18	8	3	2
Norfolk	12	4	15	3	2	11
Suffolk	12	9	15	6	2	9
Essex	13	9	16	11	3	2
SOUTHERN AND SOUTH- WESTERN COUNTIES :						
Kent	16	4	19	7	3	3
Surrey	16	4	20	0	3	8
Sussex	14	10	17	7	2	9
Hampshire	13	9	17	9	4	0
Berkshire	13	2	15	11	2	9
Wiltshire	12	9	15	8	2	11
Dorsetshire	11	11	15	6	3	7
Somersetshire	13	6	16	11	3	5
Herefordshire	13	3	16	3	3	0
Monmouthshire	16	6	18	10	2	4
Gloucestershire	12	11	15	5	2	6
Devonshire	13	9	17	1	3	4
Cornwall	14	6	17	4	2	10

[Published for the Pan-Anglican Congress Committees, who alone are responsible for these Papers.]

SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE.

LONDON : NORTHUMBERLAND AVENUE, W.C.

1908.

Being Problems for consideration at the *Pan-Anglican Congress*, 1908.

COMPANIES AND CONSCIENCE: JUSTICE AND DIVIDENDS

By CHARLES RODEN BUXTON

If our industry were simple and undeveloped, it would be unnecessary to insist upon the responsibility of the man of property. Your duty towards a person whom you employed in your own house, for instance, would clearly be, at the least, not to starve him, not to give him insufficient shelter, not to appropriate the main part of his labour for yourself, not to cast him off without a thought of his welfare when you ceased to want him.

Under the present system of investment, however, your action affects a thousand individuals where it only affected one before; and these individuals are not the people of your own locality. Finance has been delocalized. Out of sight is out of mind; and you imagine that you have escaped all responsibility, because the people you are employing are not under your eyes. The average investor feels no particular connexion with the district he inhabits; he has thrown off his sense of duty to that, and has not acquired any corresponding sense of duty to his more distant dependants.

The development of modern industry and commerce has, in fact, done a definite injury to morals; for, while it has caused much suffering and wrong, it has taught people to look on with folded hands; it has juggled with our consciences; the gain it offers to the property owner has blinded him to the responsibility it involves. Yet the thing is indisputable as soon as it is stated. Those who receive dividends are deliberately entering upon a course of conduct which affects, for good or for evil, an incalculable number of human lives. They cannot wash their hands of the result. Our conduct as shareholders must be tried by the same test as our conduct in any other capacity. The command, "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself" applies no less to the conditions of modern commerce than to any other conditions.

I

A partial remedy is to find out the immediate use to which our money is put. Many of the facts of the commercial world are matters of common knowledge; many can be learnt from the daily press; many have been accumulated by investigators such as Sir Charles Booth and Mr. Rowntree. The various branches of the Christian Social Union make it their business to inquire, each in its own district, how some of the local industries are carried on. Information as to labour conditions can be gained from Trades Councils or Trade Unions. Many industries—conspicuously the liquor traffic—are open to any amount of personal inspection. As the result of such inquiries, the conscientious property owner can secure that his money is not employed in *directly* maintaining or promoting evil. If there

are branches of industry which he considers wholly bad, or likely to do more harm than good to the State—for instance, South African mining, or the brewing industry—he can abstain from investing in them altogether. Better still, he can limit his investment either to industries with which he is himself familiar and which he can to some extent control, or to enterprises which are publicly controlled, in other words, to Government or municipal stocks in civilized countries. It is surprising that the idea of such a limitation has gained so little currency. By far the best security that evils will be brought to light and remedied, is afforded by the existence of popular control and public discussion.

If Christians would habitually impose some definite limitation of this kind—would maintain a boycott, as it were, against the application of capital to any work of whose general soundness they could not satisfy themselves—great improvements could be effected.

II

But this is not enough. We are still in the grip of a system which is too strong for us. You open a banking account, for instance ; it seems a sufficiently innocent proceeding. But you are thereby lending money to a body which will use it in maintaining enterprises of which you know nothing, and might possibly condemn. Or you insure your life ; and as you pay your premium, you let slip from your hands a sum of money which is instantly swept away to feed the vast industrial machine, it may be for good or it may be for evil. The same is the case with a thousand charitable institutions which maintain reserve funds. The money which you fancy you are devoting to the relief of suffering may be actually employed in creating the suffering that you are trying to relieve. You are brought up, in a word, against the impossibility of personally controlling the ultimate effect of your action. You put your quota into the funds of a vast and complicated system. You help to maintain it. You are responsible for its results ; but your control over it is either non-existent or negligible. Huge funds are collected, for the most part in small quantities. A whole profession, that of the stockbroker, is occupied with the mere business of transferring these sums from the amateur investor to the working capitalist. They then pass into the industrial world. At its base lie the broad foundations of agriculture, mining, and manufacture in its myriad forms. Commerce seizes upon raw materials and finished goods alike, with its vast and intricate machinery of exchange ; countless workers are employed in distributing and advertising them through a thousand channels ; a score of industries, each with innumerable subdivisions, are needed to transport them hither and thither ; at last they filter down into the hands of the retail trader, and so pass out to the consumer. The bankers, meanwhile, are supplying the trader, the distributor, and the manufacturer with the means of carrying on his business from day to day ; great financial houses are floating loans, promoting companies, and dealing in huge blocks of shares, far over the head of the ignorant private investor ; while the insurance corporations are building up

huge reserves of property, in the endeavour to abolish risks and defy the blows of fortune. Nor is the influence of capital limited to a single country; it oversteps all national boundaries; and a completely traceable train of causes connects the frauds of American railway magnates with the rise of prices in England.

Every process is inextricably intertwined with every other; and, whatever view of economics or of industry the inquirer may hold, he will find evil clinging to every one. There are trades that are evil in themselves; there are monopolies which hold the public at their mercy, extracting private gain from public interests; there is the exploitation of the weak races of the world in the interests of the white investor; there is the baneful influence of capital upon international relations—now manipulating an attack by one state on another to secure existing interests, now urging territorial expansion to open up new and profitable investments; there is the diversion of invested funds from their avowed objects towards the corruption of legislatures and the degradation of politics. There are the intolerable conditions of labour; short wages and long hours of work; constant fluctuation in the labour market; a vast mass of unorganized labour, compelled to accept whatever wage will just maintain it at the level of subsistence; great numbers of unemployed men and women, whose own self-respect and vigour is broken down, and who serve the purpose of keeping down the remuneration of the rest—the whole constituting a state of affairs which, when we consider the absolute dependence of the worker upon finding some one to employ him for wages, fully justifies the term “wage-slavery”. There is the enormous destruction of child life through bad conditions. And apart from such specific evils, there is the astonishing spectacle of three-quarters of the nation living and dying without the opportunities of self-development which render human life desirable. You cannot limit your responsibility to a single part of this complex structure. Your farmer may be sending clean milk to town, but is the dairyman adulterating it at the end of the journey? Your bicycle-maker may have a model factory, but has the rubber for his tyres been wrung by fire and sword from the natives of the Congo? Your shipping firm may treat their men fairly, but are they carrying and distributing sweated goods? Your insurance society may be honest, but are its funds invested in industries where labour is underpaid, and is its prosperity based on profits which ought to belong to the labourer?

The picture is one which appals; the average investor is overwhelmed by it; he cannot grasp the ramifications of his responsibility. At the same time, he cannot see that the accumulation of capital is wrong in itself. He sees that plenty of other people are investing their money as he does; at last, with phrases about the “life-blood of industry”, he succeeds in expelling from his mind the thought of the life-blood of men.

What is he to do? One solution would be to give up the task as hopeless, to pronounce our civilization a ghastly mistake, and, at whatever sacrifice, to get back to some primitive form of life from which social co-operation, except in its most elementary forms, should

be entirely banished. But until we can be satisfied that our social evils admit of no other remedy, we shall be slow to admit so desperate a conclusion. Surely, short of sweeping our civilization away, it must be possible to harness its mighty forces to the service of human welfare?

In point of fact, what the investor cannot do as an individual, he can do in his capacity as a citizen. What, as a matter of history, has been the means of improving our industrial system hitherto? It has been the force of organized public opinion, of the nation operating collectively through both the central and the local governments. The means of discharging our duty to God and to our neighbour lies ready to our hand in the *regulation and control of industry by law*.

How far this control should go it is not for me on this occasion to discuss. Our first duty is to support to the utmost of our power the existing laws, which secure some degree of protection for the poor. But is this code wide enough to purify the whole system? Does it secure that no dividends shall be the fruit of injustice; that the property owner shall be unable to draw in profits from tainted sources? Assuredly not; and until this is so, no Christian citizen who accepts our modern civilization at all, can possibly rest content.

There is an increasing demand, among those who realize the social basis of Christianity, for certain specific lines of reform, which constitute the minimum that any self-respecting society can demand. We must demand that the first charge upon any industry shall be a living wage for the labourer; that cheap products shall not be obtained at the cost of the degradation and slavery of the producer. It is a right policy which has induced the Christian Social Union to place the Minimum Wage—to be adjusted by wages boards for separate industries—in the forefront of its programme. We must protect childhood and old age; support the demand of the workers for a larger share in the product of industry; attack the problem of unemployment; restrict luxury.

It may be that our remedies will have to be carried further. I am not speaking of an ideal state. I am speaking of a state in which a citizen might invest capital without actually staining his hands.

As things stand, it is difficult to see how any investment can be justified, unless it is accompanied by practical support and open advocacy of social reform. That is the shape which our responsibility takes to-day—the responsibility of the property-owner before God. To imagine that, by some mysterious legal jugglery, we can shuffle out of a whole sphere of Christian duty, is surely the strangest and most perilous of hallucinations.

[Published for the Pan-Anglican Congress Committees, who alone are responsible for these Papers.]

S.A. 4 (b)

PAN-ANGLICAN PAPERS

Being Problems for consideration at the *Pan-Anglican Congress*, 1908.

THE MORALITY OF CONTROL OF CAPITAL BY LEGISLATIVE ACTION

BY THE REV. CANON H. SCOTT HOLLAND

THE authority of Public Law over Capital springs out of the sheer necessities involved in the facts. The Industrial situation, as we now know it, compels an ever wider and more thorough assertion of law in order to arrive at its own realization.

For instance, every movement of Capital is seen to be an act of the whole Industrial Community. It is impossible to fix the limits which determine either its origin, or its possibility, or its effects. We have only to recall the concurrence of forces which is assumed by the Capitalist at his work in order to see how subtle and intricate and innumerable are the threads which knit his activity up into the entire social fabric.

His power to act is supplied to him by an inexhaustible Organization which is for ever labouring to endow him with infinite resources and with measureless capacity to put them to use. He arrives at his office in the morning to find that swarms upon swarms of unknown men have been toiling through the night simply that he may be in complete possession of all the information that he needs for his next move. Wires have been pulsating with the news that he requires while he slept. From all over the face of the earth intelligence has been pouring in for his benefit. Printing-machines have clanged all night to get the material sorted and distributed, summarized, arranged, so that in a moment his eye may take in, at a glance, the movements of the world's markets and the slightest changes in its financial equilibrium. A host of men and boys are up betimes to hold it ready for him to have at his hand at whatever moment he chooses. Hundreds more are waiting to give immediate effect, through wire, and Post-office, and telephone, to any venture that he wishes to make. He has but to touch a button or two, and the entire State machinery, ever at his direct disposal, is set moving in his active service. The activity by which he accumulates wealth consists mainly in skilful manipulation of the resources which the Community has stored out of its own

endless experiences in the past, and has brought under the direction and control of the organization which it has delicately and laboriously perfected. There is no moment at which the Capitalist is not relying on the vast system of co-operating forces, on whose assistance he can confidently calculate, and which his every need and wish have at their immediate command.

His own direct motive in the action that he takes may be purely competitive. And, in old days, we used to imagine that this individual and competitive element in the act could be isolated, so that a man might claim it as his own, and have clear right to exclude anybody else from interfering with what was his own business for which he was responsible to himself alone. But now we know that, as so isolated, we are dealing with a mere intellectual abstraction, which can never pass into concrete and real existence.

For, in concrete reality, as we have seen, the man's act is never solitary. His power to compete assumes from first to last an immense world of Co-operative forces, organized for his use, and built up into an Industrial and Social Body. Unless these forces were under him, to buoy him up, and to supply him with all the opportunities under which he can successfully compete, he would be impotent. It is they that find for him his occasions, open to him the channels down which his energy can discharge itself, offer him the materials and instruments through which he can realize his desire. Social Co-operation is the ground on which alone this far-reaching Competition can rest. In Co-operation it discovers its fulcrum, its base, its weapons, its range, its mechanism, its potentialities. Society at large gives the individual the vantage from which he can afford to compete, and also the enormous area of possibilities over which his ingenuity can make play. It places its swift and complete correlation of capacities entirely under his orders to minister to his wants.

Thousands at his bidding speed
Posting over sea and land.

And who these are he can never know, and need, so far as his business goes, never ask. To protect him in his work, to secure him in his gains, Society has framed a large Body of Law ; and it keeps, at vast expense, a Judicial System that shall preserve for him his right to free activity in his own interest, as well as a host of Police who will be at his service to ward off perils and to preserve his goods in safety.

There is not an act of his, then, which Society has not accompanied, shared, authorized, enriched, enforced. There is no possible disentangling of his own private act from the

social web in which it is immeshed. There is no spot, in the Commercial Process, on which he can take his stand, and declare, "Here, I am alone. No other human being has part or lot with what I do. I am sole and independent. The cause, the force, the effect, of this particular act are all my own ; and I answer for myself, and I am responsible to myself, and to no other."

Always, he is the organ through which the Community is acting. Always, he is releasing powers which the Community has accumulated. Always, he is bringing into use tools which the Community has fashioned and supplied. Always, he is taking advantage of the organization which the Community has framed and perfected. Always, he is assuming a swarm of subtle services which the Community places ready to his hand. Always, he is setting in motion the manifold labours of others to work out his own behest. Always, he is starting effects which pass away, through incalculable vibrations, into the nervous tissue of the Body Politic. He is a living duct through which the stored energies of an entire Society pass and re-pass. In every motion that he evokes, he identifies himself with the Community, which he actualizes and embodies.

And how, then, is it conceivable that he should be able to deny to the Community its right to demand that this activity of his, which he draws from it and spends through it, should conform to its general welfare and fall within the scope of its control?

If he cannot compete except through the Co-operation of the Community, then this Co-operation is prior, in the moral order, to his Competition. The Co-operation can rightly require that the Competition, which it alone makes possible, should serve its interests. It can lawfully forbid any Competitive action that results in damage to the Co-operating Service on which it depends.

This is why Public Law is morally justified in claiming control over Capital.

Public Law is the expression of the Community's Will over ground which the Community holds and occupies. And, in this case, Capital is its creation. The Individual who competes is its own creature. He, in exercising his individual capacities, does so under social permission, as clothed upon with authority from the State, and as entitled, under that authority, to take as much advantage as he can of the opportunities laid open to him by the State. Without it he could not have moved a finger. Without its security he could not have set out on his venture. Without its protection he would have had no liberty. Without its resources he could have done nothing.

His privileges, if he has any, are of its making. He has no possible place in the market that he can derive from himself alone. And if the market that he has used for his own enrichment is not his but belongs to all these others, then he cannot enter it at all without submitting to the rules which are imposed on it by general consent. This is why he holds his wealth subject to the supreme control of such Legislation as the Community considers necessary to secure its own well-being. He has used the Community's assistance throughout. He cannot repudiate its claim to be intimately concerned with all that he does.

Or again, we can arrive at the same conclusion from a consideration of the close inter-correlation which knits the entire mass of individual activities into a single organic Whole. Industries are no longer worked side by side, as it were, in independent localities. They have been fused into a common system of Exchange. Not only do their processes overlap, not only do half a dozen separate Industries combine to make a single product, but, through the highly-organized condition of Finance, Capital passes to and fro with a liquid ease and freedom. It is like a sensitive mass pressing for outlet. It flows in and flows out, transferring itself from Industry to Industry, according to the swift shifting of opportunities, following the line of least resistance like running water, adapting itself to each varying scale and mood of the market, acting everywhere at once, feeling changes of temperature with the speed of a barometer, ever seeking to fix a new equilibrium of forces according to the turn of ever-varying conditions. Each Industry is conscious of the effects of all other Industries. Each takes on each other's fortunes. Week by week the Central Clearing-House readjusts the books of the entire Body of our Commerce. Transactions attain a balance. A fresh equilibrium is certified. Day by day, hour by hour, minute by minute, the Stock Exchange of the world notes, and names, and manipulates, the minutest indication of the direction in which changes will appear and operations assume fresh momentum. Capital is a live thing. It is an Organism that breathes and acts. It has a mind of its own; it is all but ensouled. The Banks are its brain. It puts out nerves along all the lines of its Investments. It responds to every pressure of the environment. It has the coherence and consistency of a body. And its outlook is immense. It has its eyes over all the face of the earth. The world is its parish.

And how, then, is it possible for any one man to put down his stake in this enormous venture without finding himself at once immeshed in a whole web of relationships and responsibilities? How is he to hope to play his own little game in and

with it? How can he expect to sit by the side of it and stick in his thumb and pull out a plum and walk off with it, like little Jack Horner? How can he pretend to be minding his own business, and to have the right to do so undisturbed? His business is everybody's business, and everybody's business is his. There must, inevitably, be a whole fabric of common Law under the sway of which he has passed from the moment that he took action inside this world's market and mingled his own Capital with the universal currents of this big Finance. He can only be there at all, as engaged in an adventure in which an innumerable crowd of other men is involved. He falls under stringent obligations. His activity must conform to the common and incalculable Rule.

And whence issues this social Law which determines the common Rule? What is the authority from which it is derived?

It cannot be from Capital itself, for Capital is only an abstraction. Capital is only half of the concrete fact. Capital is meaningless, except in relation to Labour. And both Capital and Labour coexist in one Community. The men who manipulate Capital are of one social body with the men who help to create the Capital by their labour. Capital itself is in a very real sense congealed Labour. Capital is for ever passing back into Labour, and Labour transmuting itself into Capital. The same man may be both Labourer and Capitalist. The two sides of a single fact are inseparable. They can be detached for analysis, for the sake of intellectual distinction, but, in reality, they both together constitute one identical existence.

And no Community, therefore, could allow one abstract section to legislate for itself, or to treat itself as separate and independent. To do so would be to divide a living creature in half. It would be death.

The Community which exists out of this correlation of Capital and Labour cannot but set itself to retain and to assert the union in which both find themselves interpreted and justified. The Community has the moral right to demand that the Rules and Regulations under which Capital does its work are such as recognize the essential interest of that Labour which is its correlative, and the permanent welfare of the Body Corporate, of which both Labour and Capital are co-ordinated functions.

It is at this point that we can understand why the State should regard powerful Trusts as a challenge or a menace to its healthy life. The Trusts represent attempts by Capital to secure monopolies of a sufficient size, or over a sufficient area, to enable it to become completely independent of any other

interest or any other control than its own. By cancelling Competition, it saves itself the effort of meeting those incessant corrective reactions which the presence of the general Society around it perpetually enforces. It escapes those modifications from within which the influx of counter-influences would naturally effect. It becomes its own master. It need consult no one but itself. It holds Labour in the hollow of its hand through its immense combination of forces. It may act beneficently if it chooses; but all this is as it chooses. It may, on the other hand, use its tremendous power to make a ring of Corn, or Cotton, or Oil, regardless of public welfare, determined only by its own independent interest. If it does this, it will do it solely by use of the entire machinery and authority of the State on its own behalf. It will appeal to the State Police to secure it against the protests of Labour. It will rest its entire activity on the fulcrum supplied it by the State organization of Tariffs and by the State Legislation on matters of Industry or Finance. The State may, at any moment, see itself compelled to place its whole power at the disposal of a vast Corporation, acting solely on its own independent behalf, unchecked and uncontrolled, dead against the well-being of Society.

Such a possibility is intolerable. No honourable State could lend itself to the service of an "Imperium" which uses the State's own Organization to make itself a Power outside the direction, or supervision, or control of the State. Capital, which exists only by permission of the State, cannot be suffered to free itself from the obligations which its very existence has already so inevitably created towards the entire Society of which it is the product.

Again, we can arrive by another approach at the same certitude.

Capital and Labour, which together constitute a single concrete fact, are, by the violent pressure of present circumstances, forced out of living touch with one another. They suffer divorce. The wide diffusion of modern industry over an immense and confused area brings this inevitably about. First, Capital, in its joint-stock form, has delocalized itself. It may exist everywhere or anywhere. The shareholders in the Company are a scattered multitude, unknown to one another, without any tangible or visible coherence. They constitute the employers; to them belong all the employers' responsibilities; the Directors are merely their representative agents. But then these employers are totally unaware who and where those whom they employ are. The Labour which at once creates, and is created by, their capital, is out of their sight, out of their horizon, out of their ken. No human

relationship springs up between them. Their obligation towards those whose work they exploit can never take any real form or clothe itself in flesh and blood. How can the Shareholders ever come into living contact with the nameless masses who toil for them? They live at a hopeless distance from the scene of their labour. There are no opportunities that can ever draw them together. They cannot form any estimate of what is going on in the dim recesses of the dark labour world, where the engines clang, and the looms whiz, and the furnaces blaze, and the chimneys belch flames. They cannot take the measure of what is right or what is wrong, they cannot follow the processes, or judge what is fair, or examine the conditions, or know what profit they have the right to take. The world, by whose sweat they live, is far away out of the range of their experience.

Yet they have to answer for it. They have made it; it has made them. By their behaviour towards it they are to be judged.

It lies in displaced hordes dropped down in strange places far from the homes where it was bred; uncounted, ungathered, uncited; spread out in sprawling suburbs, or on blank marshes at the back of our great towns. It is left to itself. It knows and sees nothing of those with whose fortunes it is so intimately concerned. There is no intercourse between the two correlative halves of the same fact. No communications pass between these associated worlds; no human touch makes them akin.

How, then, are the bonds which would bind them together to be woven? How is their intimate relationship to realize itself in equity and truth?

Once again, it is Legislation which alone can cover the ground and bridge the gulf.

Law can reach from the far homes of scattered Shareholders to the hidden swarms on whose labour they depend and for whose lives they are answerable.

Law can see what they owe to those who serve them. Law can enable them to fulfil the obligations which, if they knew how, they would surely desire to discharge.

Law can secure that the conditions of labour in every remote Factory and Workshop are such as humanity would imperatively require.

Law can give to Capital the eyes to see what its duty is.

Law is the expression of that social conscience which alone justifies Capital in existing. Capital, by itself, in the form of joint-stock Companies, has no means of exerting this conscience. It has no moral organ. Its Directorates are forbidden by their

very nature from considering anything but the interests of the Companies whose servants they are.

Some Power outside itself must step in to supply to Capital the moral nexus in its relation to Labour. It must be a Power which holds together in its wide embrace all the relationships under which Capital and Labour are co-ordinated.

This Power is the State. The State has the moral right to assert this jurisdiction over Capital because without it Capital is divorced from its proper responsibilities. It works in abstraction from Labour. And this is an unnatural and immoral condition. It traverses the first principles of concrete life in which Capital and Labour form the twin constituents of a single fact.

The control of modern Capital by the National Law is, therefore, essential to the very existence of Society as a concrete Whole.

The case has been vested in its Economic principles without any special reference to the Christian Code of Conduct; and this has been done just because we are all learning, at last, that Political Economy emphasises the bond of Brotherhood and looks to an end that is socially and morally desirable. So far as it does this Christianity accepts its scientific verdict, and is ready to learn from its experts what its actual Economic behaviour ought to be. It does not profess to have a special Political Economy of its own, but only to insist on the broad Ethical principles which Political Economy is bound to verify in detail and exhibit in action.

In the present case the Economic conclusions reached issue directly out of the moral relationships which actually hold between Capital and the Society which makes Capital possible. And, if so, it is enough to state them, in order to ensure their sanction under the Christian Code and their recommendation to the Christian Conscience.

[Published for the Pan-Anglican Congress Committees, who alone are responsible for these Papers.]

SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE.
LONDON: NORTHUMBERLAND AVENUE, W.C.

1908.

PAN-ANGLICAN PAPERS

Being Problems for consideration at the *Pan-Anglican Congress*, 1908.

TRADE ORGANIZATION

By H. B. LEES SMITH, M.A.

(By kind permission of the *Christian Social Union*)

THIS pamphlet is addressed to those who have not read many of the more recent discussions on Trade Unionism. The writer has been asked to explain to them what a modern labour leader would say in support of his position.

THE ECONOMIC ARGUMENT

In industry employers and workmen face each other as buyers and sellers of a certain service—labour. The price to be paid for it is determined, like the price of anything else, by the “higgling of the market”. Hence the workman’s wage, and therefore, in great part, his standard of life, is dependent upon his negotiations with his employer. But he has a shrewd suspicion that when the isolated labourer attempts to bargain with an employer or with a combination of employers all the advantages are on the other side. He feels that he is by no means certain of obtaining all that his labour is worth, when, with little or no money behind him, and unversed in bargaining, he faces the great firm, with its masses of capital and its skilled negotiators, linked perhaps with other firms in a common wage policy. The impulse to combine with his fellow-workmen arises, and a Trade Union is formed. We will explain more fully what is in his mind.

If one of the parties to a bargain is in such a position that, however unfavourable be the terms which he is offered, he cannot hold out against them for long, the chances are against him. If, at the same time, the other party can well afford to wait indefinitely, the inequality of strength becomes more glaring. In consequence of this the workman of to-day feels the truth of the words written by Adam Smith in 1776—“In all disputes the masters can hold out much longer. Many workmen could not subsist a week, few could subsist a month, and scarce any a year without employment. In the long run the workman may be as necessary to his master as his master is to him; but the necessity is not so immediate.”¹ But, with a Trade Union behind him, the workman is able to fall back, not merely upon his own insignificant savings, but upon the accumulated funds of thousands of his fellows.

Mr. T. S. Cree, the most acute of recent critics of Trade Unionism, will not accept this reasoning.

Economists write as if a total or partial stoppage of work meant to an employer only a little less profit at the end of the year, while to the workman it is a question of life and death for himself and his family. Now men of business know that most employers work largely with borrowed capital, and that their own capital is often a small part of the total amount of capital employed. They must pay interest on their borrowed capital, and the stoppage of work through a strike, or a number of machines standing idle, often means not less profit, but an absolute loss, and, if long continued, total ruin.²

But the argument of the economist is that the employer has the

¹ *Wealth of Nations*, chap. viii.

² *Criticism of the Theory of Trade Unions*, p. 21.

advantage over the isolated worker. To point out that if there is "a stoppage of work through a strike", that is, if the workmen are no longer acting separately, but have combined, the advantage disappears, confirms instead of refuting the reasoning.

THE BUSINESS OF BARGAINING

There are other disadvantages pressing upon the workman who stands alone. Negotiation is a business in itself, but it is not the business of a manual worker. His function is to labour. It is, however, the special work of the employer. He, or his representatives, know the condition of the market, can calculate how much the labour of the workman is worth to them, and can also form a shrewd opinion of how little he will accept. Negotiations over wages between the employer and the labourer thus resolve themselves into a match between a professional and an amateur. Again the chances are against the workman, and again he saves himself by his Trade Union. The officers of his Union do for him what he cannot do, and ought not to spend his time in doing, for himself. They make it their work to know the state of the trade, to enter into the intricate calculations often needed for piece-work systems, and to meet the employers on equal terms. Those who follow the proceedings of conciliation boards know that the workmen's representatives are quite able to hold their own with the foremost employers of labour. Besides, they depend for their livelihood only upon the men themselves, and their claws are not drawn by the fear of being victimized, which faces an ordinary workman if he puts himself at the head of a demand for better conditions. When the middle-class worker is faced by the same difficulty he meets it by the same device. Authors, for instance, whose business is to write and not to bargain, often feel themselves to be too much in the power of their publishers. Hence, in the last few years, we have seen the rise of a new profession, that of authors' agents, who do for their clients much that a Trade Union leader does for his followers.

OTHER CONDITIONS OF LABOUR

We have, hitherto, spoken only of wages. But the welfare of the workman depends just as much upon the provisions made to keep the factory clean and healthy, to regulate the length and intensity of his labour, to guard him from accident, and to compensate him if accident occurs. Here the isolated workman is still less able to defend himself, and here again the Union steps in. In many Unions the time of the officials is more fully occupied by these subjects than by questions of wages. The proportion that this work assumes in a large Society can be seen by a few extracts from the *Manifesto to Non-Unionists*, just issued by the Amalgamated Society of Railway Servants:—

During the year 1903—the last for which the complete returns issued by the Board of Trade are available—497 railway men were killed, and 14,356 were injured in the United Kingdom. The Amalgamated Society of Railway Servants realized that many of these accidents might be prevented, and would be prevented, if steps were taken to remove unnecessary dangers. Below are particulars of dangerous cases dealt with during the last four and a half years, and it will be seen that in 85 per cent. of the cases taken up, the A.S.R.S. have been successful in causing improvements to be made.

Another fruitful case of accidents is long hours. Upon this question the A.S.R.S. has taken a firm stand, and by all the means at its disposal has worked in the direction of getting the well-known excessive hours

reduced to reasonable periods. During the last four-and-a-half years no less than 233 complaints were lodged with the Board of Trade by the A.S.R.S.

Then, again, a tremendous amount of work has been done at the Head Office in advising members how to act with a view to securing adequate compensation for injuries received, and in taking legal proceedings whenever friendly negotiations have failed to secure justice. During the last four-and-a-half years no less than 348 fatal cases were dealt with, and the lump sums obtained as compensation totalled £49,716 9s. 11d.

In many other directions the interests of our members have been protected legally, and of the 161 legal cases we have had during the period under notice, 122 have been successful.

In many of these cases the State has stepped in and taken the responsibility of defending the workman upon its own shoulders. But even then the Union still has a work to do. It has to ensure that the law is enforced, and that the worst employers are thus brought up to the level of the best. How this is effected may be seen by an extract from a letter to the writer by a Lancashire cottonweaver :—

It is a common thing for Secretaries of Trade Unions to write to the Inspectors, if there are any complaints about running over-time. Still, it is not known to the public. It is about seven years since I was on the Committee of the — Association, having been elected to go on as a delegate to the — Amalgamation Meeting, which was held every six weeks. I brought before the meeting, on my own accord, about our mill running over-time. The day I went to the meeting the mill should have stopped running at 12.30, but I came out of the mill at 12.50, and it was still running. Mr. —, our Secretary, told me he would see to it, but he told me not to mention it to any one, because if it got to the ears of the Masters' Federation I should be victimized. In less than fourteen days the Inspectors appeared and caught them running over-time. The sequel was £60.

CRITICISMS OF TRADE UNIONISM

These considerations furnish the first line in the defence of Trade Unionism. But we shall not do justice to the subject unless we explain thoroughly the views of its opponents. Now, therefore, for a time we shall assume the rôle of a critic of Trade Unionism. The arguments used up to the present refer only to "short run" effects. They merely explain how a workman may make a better bargain with his employer, and there they leave the matter. But it must not be left there, for, whatever wage the workman obtains, other forces are brought into play which "in the long run" dominate the situation. In order to trace these "long run" effects we must make a short incursion into economic theory.

Capital is drawn to, or repelled from, a trade by the profits which are to be obtained in it. If these profits rise above the normal level new employers are attracted into the trade, while those already there increase their scale of production. Thus the eventual result is that the output of the trade is increased, the prices of its products fall, and profits sink back to the normal level. Similarly, if the profits are reduced below the normal level, the capital in the trade gradually diminishes. The supply of its products, therefore, decreases, and their prices rise until the profits are once again at the normal level. How does this reasoning affect Trade Unions? It is argued that it leads to the conclusion that, with or without them, the wages in a trade are "in the

long run " determined at a certain level by the forces of supply or demand. No combination of employers can for long force them below it, and no Union can keep them above it. Unions, therefore, it is claimed, are unnecessary for defence and useless for aggression.

To follow the argument, let us imagine a trade in which, to begin with, free competition reigns supreme. There is no combination among either employers or workmen. The profits of the employers and the wages of the workmen are about the same as similar capital, enterprise, skill, and industry could obtain elsewhere. Now imagine the employer to succeed in forcing the workman to accept lower wages. Is a Union necessary to enable him to raise them back again? No, answer its critics, for the action of the employers will "in the long run " defeat itself. Profits were at the normal level before. Now that wages have been reduced, they are above the normal level. But we have already seen that, if this is so, capital eventually enters the trade. Hence the demand for labour in it rises. At the same time, since the workmen are receiving less than with similar skill and industry they can earn elsewhere, their numbers gradually diminish. Thus, while on the one side employers are seeking for more labour, on the other, men are steadily drifting away. To this there can be only one end. Wages will rise again. Hence, the fact that employers beat wages down, has itself, without any Trade Union, set into operation forces which, in the long run, beat them up again. From this it is argued that a Union is unnecessary.

By parallel reasoning, if the workmen on their part assume the offensive, form a Union, and succeed in forcing their wages above those earned by similar industry and skill elsewhere, capital leaves the trade, and more labour seeks to enter it. Hence, at the same moment that fewer men are wanted, more are looking for places, and wages must, in the long run, fall to the old level. For aggressive purposes, therefore, Unions are powerless. The argument is summed up by Mr. T. S. Cree: "While the terms of a particular bargain are of importance to the individual workman and employer concerned, they are not of much importance to the workmen and employers as a whole, as there is always a compensating action going on which is bringing back wages to a true economical point."¹

This is the main criticism of Trade Unionism. It must be said at once that it contains a considerable element of truth. Its value is that it enables us to obtain a proper perspective of the limits to the possibilities of Trade Union action. We are prevented from sharing the extravagant hopes of some of its advocates, but we are at the same time saved from the equally extravagant fears of some of its opponents.

THE ANSWER

The Trade Unionist, however, has his reply. Even if wages will eventually reach "a true economical point", this is only to take place "in the long run ". But how long is the run? If, for instance, wages are forced below the true economical point, what length of time will elapse before sufficient men have moved into other trades to raise them back again? If, moreover, the tendency is for these other trades also to be dominated by combinations of employers, what is the workman to do then? These questions may refer only to "short run " effects, but meanwhile the workman is the loser. The short run of economic theory may cut a considerable length out of his working life.

¹ *A Criticism of the Theory of Trade Unionism*, p. 11.

If he always bears the brunt of the fluctuations of wages while the masters always reap the advantage, the average of his wages will clearly be lowered. Why should he tolerate such a position? Trade Unions enable him to resist this downward pressure, and perhaps to substitute an upward pressure in his own favour.

THE GOVERNMENT OF A TRADE UNION

We have hitherto spoken only of the general principles of Trade Unionism. But our account would not be complete without some description of their government and of the men who control them.

A large Trade Union generally has a separate branch or lodge in every district where a few of its members are employed. The Amalgamated Society of Engineers, for instance, has 676 branches, scattered throughout Great Britain, Canada, Australia, South Africa, New Zealand, and has even a few in the United States. The central government is in the hands of an Executive Committee. The General Secretary, the outstanding figure in the Society, devotes the whole of his time to the work, and receives a salary of from £150 to £300 a year. The Executive Committee usually consists of men still employed at the trade, and coming up to the head office at certain intervals to hold their meetings. In some Unions, however, for example, in those of the Engineers and the Boiler Makers, the members of the Executive Committee also are permanent officials. The work of the branches is mostly in the hands of branch Secretaries, who seldom receive any payment. These men spend hours each night after having already done the day's work of an ordinary man, in masses of inglorious labour, such as keeping accounts, writing minutes, corresponding with employers, and preparing reports for the head office, inspired by a devotion not unlike that found among those who do the voluntary work of many religious bodies.

One of the most important problems in the constitution of a Trade Union is also met with in that of a nation. How much power is to be given to the local authorities, and how much retained at head quarters? The reason that we refer to this is that one point in the answer given by most of the larger Unions is of peculiar importance. Strike pay is in the hands of the central Executive Committee. If a local branch comes out on strike without the consent of head quarters it must do so at its own expense. Any action which depletes the funds of the Society concerns the members as a whole, and must therefore be decided by the central officials, who represent the interests of all. The effective power to strike does not, therefore, rest with those who are in the heat of the conflict, but with men who, often from hundreds of miles away, view the situation coolly as an incident of their daily business. Their personal bias, indeed, is inclined to be strongly in favour of peace. The General Secretary of an established Union has little to gain and much to lose from a conflict. He will be involved in an immensity of labour and anxiety. If it succeeds he personally is in much the same situation as before. If it fails, discontent with his administration breaks out, rival candidates appear as his time for re-election approaches, and he may have to fight hard even to keep his position. So it happens that Trade Union officials are more often engaged in holding their followers back than in urging them on. Few of them escape being denounced for cowardice, and are often accused of having been "nobbled" by the employers. The "paid agitator" pictured by newspapers is a very rare figure, and, when he is seen, he is found among the most struggling and least important Unions. Men who are engaged in

continual negotiations with the ablest employers of labour, and whose decisions involve vast sums of money, rapidly develop into professional men of the most cautious type. A stranger wandering into the annual Trade Union Congress, and looking down on the rows of delegates, with their resolute faces, their neat clothes, and their clear-cut speech, might imagine that he was present at a gathering of leading business administrators. The idea of the ordinary Trade Union official as a "paid agitator" is found more frequently among those who never meet one, than among the employers of labour who deal with him face to face. The latter, on the contrary, are often on terms of cordial friendship with him, calling him by his Christian name. Two years ago a testimonial was subscribed for "Mabon" (William Abraham, M.P.), the most conspicuous labour leader who has been known among the South Wales miners. It was initiated by the employers, and a great proportion of the subscriptions came from them.

FRIENDLY BENEFITS

A common mistake is the belief that the main part of the expenditure of a Trade Union is for fighting purposes. The strike is, indeed, the weapon which it always holds in reserve; but, in addition, each member usually looks to it to enable him to provide, by his own forethought, against many of the contingencies of life. If he is out of work, or ill, or if an accident strikes him down, it comes to his aid. When he dies it saves him from a pauper's burial. In some cases it supports him in his old age. All this it does out of the savings of himself and his fellow-members. At a liberal estimate not more than one-fifth of the average expenditure of Trade Unions is on strikes or disputes. The following figures, published in the latest Report on Trade Unions issued by the Board of Trade is worth careful attention.¹

EXPENDITURE OF THE 100 PRINCIPAL UNIONS DURING THE TEN YEARS FROM 1895-1904

Total expenditure	£16,060,000.
Expenditure on "Disputes" or "Strikes"	£2,343,000, or 14·6 per cent.
Expenditure on Unemployed or Out of Work Benefit.....	£3,608,000, or 22·5 per cent.
Expenditure on Other Benefits (principally sick, accident, funeral, and superannuation or old age)	£6,658,000, or 41·4 per cent.
Expenditure on Working, and Miscellaneous expenses	£3,451,000, or 21·5 per cent.

It will be seen from these figures that only 14·6 per cent. of the expenditure has been on strikes. But there is some difficulty in distinguishing payments to the Unemployed from payments due to a dispute, as unemployed benefit is often given to those whose non-employment is either directly or indirectly due to a strike. The Report states that in such cases the amount has been estimated, where possible, and treated as dispute benefit. It is, however, best to allow for some miscalculation, and merely to say that certainly not more than 20 per cent., or one-fifth, is spent upon strikes.

Some of these benefits can, of course, be provided by Friendly Societies; but the most important of them, the "Unemployed Benefit", upon which alone more is spent than upon strikes, is peculiar to Trade

¹ *Report of the Chief Labour Correspondent of the Board of Trade on Trade Union in 1902-4*, Cd. 2838, pp. 15, 7, 23.

Unions. The persons who know with most certainty whether a man is genuinely unemployed or not are those who work day by day at his side. Hence Trade Unions, consisting of men working together at the same trade, at present stand out as incomparably the most successful agencies for the relief of unemployment.

We have stated the main considerations upon which a judgement of Trade Unions should depend. We cannot enter in detail into the different methods adopted by each of them. But it ought not to be denied that these methods may sometimes be mischievous, as, for example, although this device is disappearing, when a Union puts unnecessary difficulties in the way of those who wish to enter the trade. But the readers for whom this pamphlet is written should remember that they are likely to hear much more of the attacks on Trade Unions than of their defence. Lately, for instance, the most common charge has been that some Unions try to prevent one man from earning more than others. It must be said frankly that Trade Unions are not without faults. Where they have hindered men doing their best and fullest work they have done wrong, and tended to bring their movement into discredit. There are, however, qualifying circumstances. The charge is not brought against those who are paid piece-wages, and the great majority of Trade Unionists work under that system. In those cases of payment by time, where the evil occurs, the explanation is often as follows. There are many "jobs" on which a gang of men have to work together, so that the pay of all must be the same. But the strength of all is not the same. An inevitable dilemma therefore presents itself. Either the weaker must be driven beyond their strength, or the stronger must work below their strength. Employers naturally find it well worth while to pay the most powerful man a little extra, or to give him a glass of beer to work to the top of his strength, and so to compel the rest to hustle after him. But the others naturally protest against being driven beyond their powers by these "sloggers" or "chasers". To them it appears an attempt on the part of the employers to pay one man a few pence extra in order to "sweat" an unreasonable amount of work out of the rest without paying for it. Thus, even in what appears to be one of the least defensible devices of Trade Unionism, there are distinctly two sides to the question.

In any case, our judgement of Trade Unionism should be formed on the general principles for which it stands, rather than on its incidental merits or defects. Nothing is so mischievous as to attack Trade Unions in general because of particular methods adopted by some of them. Those at fault are not improved by indiscriminate onslaughts on their good and bad characteristics alike. The better-conducted are embittered by the injustice, and taught to believe that the more comfortable classes can be moved by nothing but force.

A SCHOOL OF SELF-GOVERNMENT

The future historian may point to our discussions on Trade Unionism as a curious example of a lack of proper perspective. He may see that their real importance lay in their political effect, and not in the merely economic questions of whether they raised or lowered wages, or whether they helped or hindered trade. Political philosophers have insisted that in order to ensure the qualities required for democratic government the active citizens should have the opportunity for continuous experience in the conduct of self-governing institutions. There are now sixty-three working-men in the House of Commons, of whom fifty-six are Trade Union officials. Many observers have been surprised at the

ease with which they have adjusted themselves to that assembly, and at the great respect which they command there. But this was expected by all who knew much of our artisan life. The country is covered by a network of self-governing institutions in which the energetic young workman is continually training himself in the arts of a representative assembly. He spends night after night each week in helping to administer Trade Unions, Co-operative Societies, Friendly Societies, Working Men's Clubs, or the organizations attached to many religious bodies. These are the sources from which the capacity for self-government is drawn, and the most important of them is the Trade Union.

Let us follow the career of a young workman who is destined to represent his fellows in the House of Commons. He begins as an active member of his Trade Union branch. He is soon elected on to its Committee, and finally becomes its Secretary. Then, during a course of years, his reputation spreads through the other branches in the country. Meanwhile, he wins a seat on the Council or Board of Guardians of his town, becomes known as one of its leading local administrators, and so prepares himself for wider spheres. A vacancy occurs at last on the Central Executive Committee. Many candidates are nominated, but he, no longer young, triumphs over them. More years pass, and then the great opportunity arrives. The General Secretary dies, or retires, and the Union is agitated by the contest for the succession. Eager canvassing begins, manifestoes are issued setting forth the claims of the different candidates, many of them well-known figures already. At last our friend wins the position for which, when he started his upward course, there were perhaps fifty or a hundred thousand possible competitors. Now comes a period of still greater responsibility, in which he plays his part in controlling the destinies of one of our national industries. Finally, he is elected to represent an industrial constituency in the House of Commons. Is it surprising that he does not compare so unfavourably with rising barristers, or young men with family influence, but no personal achievement behind them?

It is, then, as a training ground for self-government that Trade Unionism may most profoundly modify the course of our history. Already it is remarkable that the political labour movement in Great Britain is following a course which marks it off sharply from the parallel movements on the Continent. One reason is that here it is dominated by practical administrators trained in the school of Trade Unionism. Not only, too, do Trade Unions train our artisans in democracy, but they prove them to be ready for it. For here we have already great self-governing institutions which have arisen, not from legislation and not from the patronage of the more comfortable classes—for they have feared and tried to strangle them—but from the natural genius of our people.

[Published for the Pan-Anglican Congress Committees, who alone are responsible for these Papers.]

SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE.

LONDON: NORTHUMBERLAND AVENUE, W.C.

1908.

S.A. 4(d)

PAN-ANGLICAN PAPERS

Being Problems for consideration at the *Pan-Anglican Congress*, 1908.

THE UNEMPLOYED

By F. LEWIS DONALDSON, M.A.

VICAR OF ST. MARK'S, LEICESTER

(*By kind permission of the Christian Social Union*)

OF all social problems that of "the unemployed" is, by common consent, the most urgent. At the recent Trade Union Congress it was unanimously resolved that "this is the most vital and urgent question affecting the interests of the wage-workers of the United Kingdom".

The Evil.—The evil is not to be measured by statistics of the number of men "out-of-work". It is not merely that, even in the well-organized trades, from two to four out of every hundred workmen are unemployed at the best of times—a percentage which rises occasionally in times of bad trade to ten or twenty per cent., and among unskilled labourers to an unknown height. The gravest part of the problem is the "under-employment"—often chronic—of the whole class of casual workers, numbering probably millions of male labourers (not all unskilled), and thousands of women, especially "out-workers".

The irregularity and intermittence of casual employment have, at the best of times, demoralizing effects on family life and personal character. In seasons of depression these become ruinous. To these deteriorating influences literally millions are now exposed.

Origins of the Evil.—We need not here inquire to what extent these evils (and especially the practice of intermittent casual employment) have been originated or intensified by the industrial revolution of the eighteenth century, by the enormous growth of towns in the nineteenth, or by the competitive world-commerce that characterizes the twentieth. What is clear is that to-day, not only do new inventions or changes of fashion or trade occasionally deprive thousands of blameless families of their accustomed livelihood, and both cyclical and seasonal depressions recurrently throw tens of thousands out of work through no fault of their own, but, even in good times, the very system of casual employment for a day's work or a few hours' work at a time, without any organized provision for the rest of the time, makes it almost impossible for hundreds of thousands of poor households to maintain a regular, provident, and thrifty existence.

The Causes Economic not "Personal".—These and other such considerations point to the fact that the root causes of the evil are economic, and have less to do with the "character" of the workers than with the industrial conditions which society has allowed to develop. Hence, in recent years, the change of public opinion upon the subject. A few years ago "unemployed" was a term of blame; now it is a term of pity. We hear less than we did about "ne'er-do-

well's", "loafers," and so forth. For we have learnt by intricate investigation that though character is priceless, and technical training important, yet the possession neither of good character nor of technical skill by all would wholly remove the causes of unemployment, and those of the still graver evil of irregular "under-employment" which lie in the forms of business organization which the wage-earners cannot themselves alter.

National Responsibility.—Besides, and partly because of these considerations, a new moral conception of corporate or national responsibility has arisen. In the light of present knowledge, it becomes impossible to throw the whole weight of responsibility upon the workless themselves.

Men who, for instance, in middle life, are cast out of their employment by a change of commercial process, or some other industrial cause, are under present economic conditions practically helpless. Too old, unsuited to learn a new trade, they rapidly drift into a condition of vague and hopeless wandering. Those who can obtain no better means of livelihood than the demoralizing casual labour of the docks and wharves, or of the "sweated" home-working trades, cannot, by any possibility, make these occupations into sources of regular weekly incomes, or avoid being reduced to starvation level whenever trade is bad.

We have learnt, in fact, that the main causes of unemployment being economic, "charity" is wholly inadequate as a solution, and that the "Poor Law" is not only no remedy but harsh and even cruel, because it inflicts the stigma of pauperism upon those who are compelled by want of regular employment to seek its aid.

We must therefore look for remedy in the direction of a better ordering of industrial conditions, and to national co-operation to this end.

The "Unemployed" and the "Unemployable".—The first step towards real remedy lies in drawing clearly the distinction between "unemployed" and "unemployable". But it should be noted that there is a quite inevitable tendency for the one to become the other. The "unemployed" of one year may be the "unemployable" of the next. When a workman becomes workless, and for months, or even years, is left to himself, and to wander hither and thither for work he cannot find, he rapidly degenerates. First, his trade position is broken, then his home, and then his heart. This is the fate of thousands now designated "unemployable", who once were skilled and honourable workmen.

Physically and Mentally Defective.—But beyond these are the aged, the physically weak, the halt, the maimed, the blind, the deaf and dumb, and the epileptics, consumptives, and inebriates. Finally, there is the comparatively small class of those who might work but will not.

All these classes need, and should receive, separate treatment. The State (i. e., we ourselves, in our corporate capacity) should save these, the industrially "lost". Even those reluctant to work should

be saved "so as by fire", and set to work in colonies of a penal but reformatory kind, of which we have a good example in that of Merxplas, in Belgium. The problem of whether provision for old age, upon a large scale, should be made from national resources must be faced. For the physically and mentally incompetent, houses of consolation and redemption should be established.

Positive Remedies.—A short leaflet can give few details. But it is clear that when the classes named above have been eliminated, the problem of "unemployment" will be shorn of half its horror. We shall then have to deal with the industrial problem only, great in extent, terrible in its results, and ever expanding, but confined to its legitimate dimensions and character.

The unemployed, whose condition constitutes this problem, may be divided into (a) those who, at the best of times, are only intermittently employed—e.g., dock and wharf labourers, out-workers in sweated trades, &c.; (b) those workless through seasonal causes—e.g., house painters and stone-masons in winter; (c) those workless through temporary depression of trade; and (d) those workless through changes in the methods or the localities or the products of industry.

The first and principal step must be to substitute organization for anarchy in industry, where that anarchy is demonstrably injuring the weaker among us. Would it not be possible to expand the Labour Exchanges which have been tentatively established under the Unemployed Workmen's Act, 1905, into a complete national system, under the Board of Trade; in which all labourers not in regular employment of a continuous character should register themselves, with the object of so dovetailing the jobs offered as to make employment continuous for each worker, though still given only intermittently by each employer—as is now done, for instance, to a great extent, in the case of trained nurses for the sick? Would it not be possible, by legislation, to *compel* those employers who could not, or did not, choose to guarantee a minimum period of regular employment to their wage-earners, and who wished to continue taking on men for the day or by the hour, *to hire those men through the Labour Exchange only*, so as to enable the demoralizing systems to be made as little demoralizing as possible? There would then be only a residuum waxing and waning according to the industrial circumstances of each locality, for whom no employment at all could be found.

The second step must be to equalize, as far as may be practicable, the present varying aggregate volume of demand for labour. We cannot control the vicissitudes of seasons, weather, changes of fashion, alteration of industrial processes, the vagaries of fashion, or the consumers' caprices. It may be difficult indefinitely to extend the sort of intelligently deliberate adjustment of production to demand such as distinguishes the highly organized co-operative movement. But something effective could probably be done by concentrating the Government and municipal orders for new workshops, new buildings, painting and renovating existing structures, non-urgent printing, and even the annual embodiment of militia regiments for training, upon

those seasons of the year, and those years in the numerical cycles, in which the aggregate volume of demand for labour is lowest.

The third step must be for the community, as a whole, to deal wisely, humanely, and without dishonour, in each case according to its needs, with the ultimate residuum, numerically great or small, individually blameless or culpable, fit or "unemployable", that it finds upon its hands. For the able-bodied adults who find themselves workless there should be provided, not artificially created work at wages, but temporary subsistence in return for training (physical, mental, and technological) in order to fit them, according to their circumstances, (a) for more efficient work in their old trades, if these are only temporarily depressed, (b) to take up new trades, (c) to migrate to other parts of the United Kingdom, where their labour is wanted, or (d) to emigrate, if they so desire, to new lands.

For all this, the inevitable discipline and systematic regimen of residential farm colonies, and day or residential industrial or technical schools, should afford the necessary machinery for providing means of subsistence for the husband and father (with home aliment for the family) in such a way as to check "industrial malingering", and invigorate instead of, like the workhouse, demoralizing the patient.

For any who may prove recalcitrant, or incurably idle, we must try the more drastic cure of a reformatory penal settlement.

Conclusion.—There is no doubt that these are real, though partial, remedies for unemployment. But it is clear, also, to the present writer (though he cannot commit the Christian Social Union to this view) that, this tragedy being an invariable concomitant of the competitive system of industry, there can be no permanent remedy except in the substitution of the co-operative for the competitive principle in the constitution of the industrial life of the nation.

The Religious Principle.—Further, in all these considerations we must keep in mind the stern tragedy involved. In a highly organized state of society, to be "unemployed" is to be outcast and lost. It means the degradation of human lives, the destruction of homes, and the breaking of human hearts. The Church's promulgation of the commandment, "Six days shalt thou labour," implies our responsibility for those who seek to fulfil the sacred law, but who, under the present conditions of industrial life, cannot. The appeal of the workless is not merely for the right to live. It is a nobler cry—for the right to work in order that they may live, and in order that they may be a help and not a burden to society. In the parable of the labourers in the vineyard—a parable of the unemployed—the lord goes forth even unto the eleventh hour to give work to those who seek it. In this parable is presented an image of that duty which is now before both Church and Nation.

[Published for the Pan-Anglican Congress Committees, who alone are responsible for these Papers.]

SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE.

LONDON: NORTHUMBERLAND AVENUE, W.C.

1908.

Being Problems for consideration at the *Pan-Anglican Congress*, 1908.

CHARITABLE RELIEF

BY THE REV. W. W. HOUGH, VICAR OF LEWISHAM

The need of the Case—

I. PRESENT METHODS—NEGATIVE.

The consequent harm—

1. Funds misapplied.
2. Injury to character.
3. Injury to cause of religion.

II. BETTER METHODS—POSITIVE.

1. *Consideration—*

- i. Careful investigation.
- ii. Family the unit.
- iii. Adequate help.
- iv. Purpose of relief.
- v. Importance of character.

2. *Co-operation—*

- i. Parochial relief Committee.
- ii. Co-operation with Poor Law.
- iii. With other charitable agencies.
- iv. Guild of Help.

VERY much has been said and written of late on the question of Charitable Relief, and it is a question to which we need to give careful and serious thought.

In the first place we recognize the painful and patent fact that in all our large towns and in many of our country districts a vast extent of poverty and want exists; as Mr. Charles Booth says in his *Life and Labour*, "Hundreds of thousands of our neighbours in London are ill fed, ill clad, and ill housed, and are ever at the mercy of any misfortune an ill wind may bring."

It would be difficult to exaggerate the amount of pain and injury caused by such privation.

It is terrible to think of the children who are permanently weakened, dwarfed, and stunted in consequence of an insufficiency of fresh air and good food, this insufficiency tending to the degeneration both of the physique and the morale of the race.

For a time such degeneration might be hid; the influx of fresh strong country life into our towns brings with it vigour, but now that we have another generation town-born, town-bred, reared in chronic want sometimes bordering on destitution, we find a state of things that is a menace to the social well-being of the whole.

And in the second place it is recognized that the Church cannot "leave it alone". "If one member suffer, all the members suffer with it." Body and soul are so closely united that those who work among the poor and suffering for their spiritual good cannot possibly ignore their temporal needs. The Incarnation manifested in the Ministry of our Blessed

Lord has taught us the dignity of the human body, and the infinite compassion with which love inspires Christ's followers for every human need.

Poverty must meet with compassion, and "those who visit in the name of Christ are bound to strive to relieve the distress they find".

I. But the methods by which such relief has been administered by religious people or organizations have at times been deplorable. Side by side with the poor in town or country are those who are endowed with varying degrees of surplus wealth. Religion teaches these people that they must give largely of their substance in alms. Warm feelings are aroused, kind hearts are touched and money has been given without much thought, just enough to quiet the conscience of the giver. It all seems so simple and natural—we hear the cry of distress, upon the immediate impulse we give something which really costs us nothing; we hear the words of gratitude, a glow of fervour pervades us, we feel so good, we never take the trouble to investigate what permanent good our gift has done, and should be distressed to find that the recipient was none the better for it—sometimes the worse.

It is the easy thing to give; but the easy thing is not always the best or even the right thing.

We are familiar with such impulsive and irresponsible charity and find it on every hand. The frequent calls at all hours, especially late on a Saturday night, for a "ticket" or money for a night's lodging. The kind, unwise, tender-hearted visiting ladies who always have a shilling ready for every tale of woe. The people who will give to every chance beggar, "because they do not like to refuse." Such emotions are dangerous and need to be restrained as other unbridled desires. Bread tickets, coal tickets, meat tickets can be had for the asking, often to be bartered at less than their face value for current coin of the realm. Doles are showered on those who attend a meeting or occasionally frequent a place of worship.

If one could gather together the total amount of money spent thus indiscriminately in one year, what an amazing amount it would be. And what is the result of it all? The real permanent good is infinitesimal, the actual harm is very great.

Let me mention three evil consequences of the unwise almsgiving that has been, and still is prevalent among Christian people.

1. *Funds are misapplied.* Do the right people get the help? The least deserving are always the most ready to beg,

and therefore such almsgiving is creating an ever increasing class of professional beggars who make an excellent livelihood by spinning a plausible tale, mysterious marks are placed on the walls of our house to tell the next beggar with what reception he is likely to meet, and the money given is worse than wasted; while those who have still retained their self-respect remain at home, hide their poverty beneath a clean and tidy exterior, so that the mere outward observer would not detect the real privation that exists. It needs to be sought. "*I came to seek!*"

If people do not ask it is assumed they have no need, and the whole system becomes a gigantic scramble—the rough, the strong, the impudent get all; the modest, the shy, the retiring refuse to join the discreditable throng.

2. *Injury to the character of the recipient, while poverty is aggravated rather than relieved.* This is more serious still, the money is not merely wasted but is misapplied, with disastrous results.

A poor district is what we call "relieved", should we not say "burdened", by continuous gifts, various sects strive one with another, competing which can give the most; and yet in spite of it all there seems no end, not even betterment; the "daughters of the horse leech" ever cry: Give, give! They are never better off, the homes are as dirty, the clothes shabby as ever, and the people become more degraded, less self-respecting. It is inevitable; whenever a family becomes thus dependent on charity it is extremely difficult for self-respect to be maintained. The evil conditions of a neighbourhood may be accentuated by such unwise action. Undesirables have been known to migrate from other parts to a parish where they heard a good deal of charity was going, to the consequent deterioration of the parish. The cause is not hard to find. The family finds help readily given by one, they immediately take the same story to another, without mention of the first, with a similar result, and again to a third and so on. It has been proved again and again that one family is receiving help at the same time from five or six different organizations without the donors having knowledge that any help was given other than their own.

In consequence of such easily found relief the family grows void of independence and self-reliance. In consequence of such practical deceit its members become shifty and immoral. In all such cases it is invariably found that the family is none the better for help so given, but descends steadily in the social and moral scale, reaching at last the state of those wretched ones who are "unhelpable".

3. *The cause of religion when associated with charitable gifts suffers in the eyes of those who are outside its influence.*

It is sad to read that so much that is done in the name of Religion only tends to bring discredit on the religion it professes to serve.

The healthier-minded independent members of the working classes look with contempt on the wholesale bribery practised by religious bodies, and a great deal of the indifference to things of religion is due to this cause.

In parish after parish where pecuniary advantages attach to attendance at a mothers' meeting, where rewards are given for church-going or the joining of clubs, it is admitted that with so much cadging and hypocrisy it is difficult to know who are genuinely amenable to religious influence or not.

I wish to close this which one may call the negative side of the question with the closing words from the Report of the Joint Committee of the Convocation of Canterbury on the moral witness of the Church on economic subjects. "Finally, we feel that the existing methods by which the Church relieves the poor—that is, the administration of 'charity' by the Church, as by Christian bodies generally—has been shown in its results to be singularly unproductive of permanent good.

"As regards the poor, the results have not proved satisfactory in the past, and neither response nor result are greatly different now. On the other hand, the existing system is responsible for much alienation from church, and from religious worship, of self-respecting workers, who are afraid of being supposed to come 'for what they can get'. We think that such considerations will tend, not indeed to make Christians disparage or neglect the duty and privilege of almsgiving, but to make them feel that something more is wanted than improvements in our methods of administering charitable relief. We have to go deeper to the grounds of the existing misery, and want and unemployment; and while we do our best to deal with the present distress, direct our chief attention towards furthering the reorganization of society on such principles of justice as will tend to reduce poverty and misery in the future to more manageable proportions."

II. Then turning to the positive side: What can be done to remedy the ills? How best may relief be administered?

May I suggest two words?

I. Consideration. 2. Co-operation.

I. CONSIDERATION

"Blessed is the man that considereth the poor and needy." We need more careful thought. Again and again touched

by a moving story, stirred by a generous impulse, people will readily give money without inquiry whether the story is true or the relief adequate. People hate anything that gives trouble, but if we hope to do any permanent good it can never be done in a casual off-handed way, we need to take care and pains.

Just giving from emotion needs to be controlled like all other unrestrained desires.

The consideration will follow these lines :—

i. Careful investigation into the truth of the case. It is very difficult for those who have not been taught by painful experience to realize the untruthfulness of uneducated people. Sometimes it is of malicious intent, deliberately telling lies to obtain money, to help such is just to encourage sin ; but more often it is a kind of embroidery of facts, exaggeration, carelessness of statement which leaves an entirely different impression upon the hearer than the truth. If we hope in any way to be a real help it can only be after a most careful investigation of all the facts, and to leave nothing to chance. This will necessarily take time and trouble, but it is time and trouble well spent. Of course people must not be left to starve while inquiry is being made. Interim help can always be given, though these cases of real urgent necessity are rarer than is often supposed.

ii. The unit to be considered is the *family*, not the individual; for the family is the true unit of our social life. To weaken the ties of family life is fatal. To teach the parents they have no responsibility for their children, that other people will relieve them of the burden, is wrong ; as also not to insist, where possible, that the children when earning money are bound to help the rest of the family.

The family is God's institution, and true charitable relief will endeavour to strengthen rather than weaken the family tie.

iii. The help that is given should be *adequate* to meet the need. To dole out a shilling grocery ticket to a case of great distress is to mock and not to relieve.

If the case is worth helping at all, it is worth helping well ; and it is far better to give adequate relief to a few families than insufficient relief to many.

iv. In all cases we should remember that the purpose of our relief is to be able to place the family beyond the need for relief ; to restore it to a position of independence again.

We shall probably find many cases where this is impossible—families that we are not able adequately or permanently to help, chronic out of work cases, unemployable men, &c.—such

cases are best left alone. We must recognize that it is impossible for us by charitable relief to abolish poverty, and we must learn that in some cases it is really kindest and best to refuse help, though this lesson is very hard to learn.

v. Finally, we must ever bear in mind that in all our relief it is the *character* which we seek to raise; if our help tends to deteriorate character, it had better be not given. Often the instrument used to raise character is monetary aid, but not always; and one sometimes feels that the cases we really help most satisfactorily are those in which no money or material help is given.

It is difficult to give money without the danger of pauperizing the recipient, and above all else we must strive to preserve the *self-respect* of those we wish to help.

Further, the question of religious belief should never enter into charitable relief; *character*, not *creed*, must be the test. Some of these considerations may seem hard, some utopian—but in this matter it is most important to have a high standard and to try and realize it in actual working.

2. CO-OPERATION

Great waste is caused by lack of co-operation, and infinite harm is done by competition.

i. In each parish there should be co-operation among the workers, no visitor should be allowed to give indiscriminately on his or her sole responsibility.

Relief should only be administered by means of a parochial committee, on which some laymen experienced in these matters should be asked to serve, as also representatives from the local C.O.S. and Board of Guardians.

This committee would meet weekly or fortnightly according to need, and should have the assistance of a trained worker; and each case requiring help would be carefully discussed, information being supplied by the visitor on a regular printed form, and it should be clearly recognized that no relief, otherwise than immediate interim relief, should be given except by order of this committee.

The relief thus voted should be given by lay almoners, visitors, or the like, *but never by the clergy*.

Such work needs *training*, and no one should grudge the effort and quiet study that are needed.

ii. Co-operation should be sought with the Poor Law authorities; our relieving officers are as a rule a most intelligent, human and kindly class of men, and their advice is simply invaluable. A parochial relief committee should never supplement parish relief; for this latter will never be made

adequate so long as the guardians think it will be supplemented from charitable sources.

Leave the Poor Law to manage its own cases, and let the parochial committee either take worthy "helpable" cases from the guardians, or better still never allow deserving families to apply for Poor Law relief at all.

If the Committee consider that the Poor Law Relief is insufficient the Guardians should be so informed; they are generally most grateful for information which it may otherwise be difficult to obtain.

iii. Co-operate, where possible, with other charitable organizations, the C.O.S., or neighbouring churches and chapels. It is notoriously difficult to obtain co-operation from other bodies of Christians not in communion with our own; but it should be sought strenuously and patiently.

iv. But further still, one feels that all these are but steps towards a higher ideal. Are we not feeling our way towards a broad organization that shall embrace all forms of charitable relief, somewhat after the manner of the "Elberfeld" system. Of course this would need adaptation in English towns, but the scheme has been adopted with conspicuous success in the Bradford City Guild of Help. We need to have working side by side in each municipality two bodies—(1) Administering the Poor Law Relief; (2) Administering all Charitable Relief. The character of the applicant alone deciding by which of the two the family should be helped.

Into such a "Guild of Help" *all* the moneys given for charitable relief would be poured. There would be no longer any "poor funds" or relief committees in connexion with our churches. Every case of need would be dealt with by its "Helpers"; and the Christian members of each church and chapel would supply the means deemed necessary by the guild for each particular case. It should be illegal for money to be given individually and indiscriminately, for relief is a matter in which society must act in its corporate capacity.

We are not sufficiently educated to accept all this as yet, but we are learning, and we hope that the Royal Commission now sitting on this question will teach us much, and perhaps recommend some such corporate action.

Such methods are not, and need never become, hard and unchristian, but should ever be instinct with the very Spirit of Christ. Prompted by Christian love and sympathy; carried out not with the selfish view of relieving our own feelings and doing the easiest thing, but for the purpose of helping most those for whom we really care; resulting in the uplifting of character and the development of sturdy self-respect and

self-reliance; making the weak strong, a "work begun, continued, and ended in Him."

Finally we must ever bear in mind those weighty words from the Report of the Joint Committee of the Convocation of Canterbury, quoted on p. 4.

Administration of Relief will never cure the ills and misery, we need to go deeper and correct the causes. Suffering must inevitably follow wrong doing, whether in the individual or society, and we must never think that by sentimental pity we can evade the inexorable law of God.

Injustice on the part of society towards the individual, and indulgence on the part of the individual, must inevitably bring suffering, and therefore side by side with a wiser administration of Charitable Relief we need to work for the reorganization of society and the reformation of the individual on the principles of righteousness and self-control.

A FEW BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS RECOMMENDED.

Life and Labour in London. Religious Influences. 7 vols.

Charitable Relief. By Rev. C. F. Rogers. 2s. 6d.

Rich and Poor. By Mrs. Bernard Bosanquet. 3s. 6d.

Occasional Papers of the London Charity Organization Society. 2s. 6d.

First Annual Report of the Winchester Diocesan Advisory Committee (1906-7). 6d.

The City Guild of Help. Bradford. 1d.

Organization of Edinburgh Charities. 6d.

[Published for the Pan-Anglican Congress Committees, who alone are responsible for these Papers.]

SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE.

LONDON: NORTHUMBERLAND AVENUE, W.C.

1908.

PAN-ANGLICAN PAPERS

Being Problems for consideration at the *Pan-Anglican Congress*, 1908.

RELIGION AND WAGES

By A. J. CARLYLE, M.A.

CHAPLAIN AND LECTURER OF UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, OXFORD

(By kind permission of the *Christian Social Union*)

THERE are, no doubt, still some people who think that there is no relation between religion and wages, and, perhaps, even those who do understand that there is some relation between them do not understand how important it is.

Some of the old political economy books say that wages are determined by the demand for and the supply of labour, and that they cannot be affected by anything else, so that it is useless even to consider what is a fair and reasonable wage, or to try to persuade people to pay it. *We all know now that this is simply a mistake*, but the influence of these old false views may still be traced in the notion that religion can have nothing to say in determining the rates of wages, but that these must be left to be determined by economic forces. *We, on the contrary, wish to urge upon you that there is no test of the truth of your religion so real as this question: "What rate of wages do you pay?" "What wages are paid to the people who make the things which you buy?"*

Wages are actually determined at present by many and complicated causes, but if we put the matter summarily, wages are actually in most cases the least that the employer can get the labourer to take, the most that the worker can get the employer to give. Wages are determined, not by the needs of the worker, but, except in a few cases, and except when the Trade Unions have been able to fix a standard or "living" wage, by economic conditions and circumstances which take no account of his needs.

What are the results of this? The results of this are that a certain number of highly skilled artisans have been able to secure for themselves wages which may average from thirty to fifty shillings in the week; that there are an immense number of working men who earn in town about twenty shillings in the week, and in the country, especially in the Midlands and southern counties, some fifteen or seventeen shillings in the week, *a wage which is hardly sufficient to provide them with the bare necessities of life*; while beside these there is a great class—including especially the majority of women workers—which exists in constant want, which can never earn enough to get proper food, or clothes, or shelter. This is without taking account of the poverty which is brought upon people by their own vices.

How many there are in this class of the worst sweated trades we cannot say with certainty; but it is a class which must probably be numbered in millions; a class which can never provide itself with the necessities of life, which is always hungry and ill-clothed, usually

physically undeveloped, suffering from frequent illness, and living short and maimed lives.

What are we as Christian people to say to this? What can we say but that these conditions are abhorrent and intolerable to us, and that they must be condemned by every Christian man and woman!

What! Are we content to live upon, perhaps to profit by, the want, the misery, the inevitable degradation of our fellow men and women, and of the little children?

What can we say as Christian people but that *the wages of the labourer must be the first charge upon any industry*: that no industry is to be tolerated which is based upon the want and misery of our fellow creatures. That is, that so far as we employ labour, we must never pay wages which are not sufficient to keep the labourer and his family in health and strength; *that is, we must pay a "living wage"*. And further, if we are Christian people we must do our best to set forward all practicable remedies for underpayment, whether by the organization of the labourer in Trade Unions, or by means of legislation; while we should do all that we can to support those employers who are known to pay the standard wages, and to provide good conditions for the workpeople.

This principle of the "living" or "standard" wage, though there are some persons who do not understand it, is good political economy, for the wealth of a country is really founded upon the efficiency of its workers, that is, upon their health and strength, their industry and their intelligence. And certainly it is the only Christian principle of wages, for the workers are men and women like ourselves; the children of one Father, made like us for a life which is truly human and truly divine; and how shall we answer for them, if we have made our profit or enjoyed our comfort at the expense of their misery and destruction?

[Published for the Pan-Anglican Congress Committees, who alone are responsible for these Papers.]

SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE.

LONDON: NORTHUMBERLAND AVENUE, W.C.

1908.

Being Problems for consideration at the *Pan-Anglican Congress*, 1908.

THE FUNCTION OF THE CLERGY IN REGARD TO ECONOMIC LIFE

BY THE REV. W. CUNNINGHAM, D.D., ARCHDEACON OF ELY

I

THERE are two great principles of personal duty, in regard to economic life, which are insisted upon in scripture; they have had a prominent place in Church teaching—both by precept and example—in the past, and there is no difficulty in advocating and applying them in the present day.

One is the Christian view as to *property*—that all human possessions, of every kind, are held as a trust from the God who has made all things and assigned them to man to use. The owner of possessions of any sort is bound to use them as a trust, and cannot claim to be irresponsible. On this it seems unnecessary to enlarge.

The other personal duty of universal obligation is that of *working*—of giving active effect to the will of God. The treatment of this duty—as not merely prudential conduct, but as a privilege of co-operating with God Himself—is distinctive of Christian as compared with Jewish morality. Work is to be thought of as a personal duty, and the maxim, “whatever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might,” is of universal application.

These two principles, between them, cover a very large part of economic life; in all communities, in every stage of civilization, property, either common or private, exists, and work is done; and they give a great deal of guidance as to personal duty even in the most complex states of society, where money economy is in vogue. They apply not only to communities in every phase of civilization, but to all classes within the community. The conception of trusteeship in property gives a basis from which to denounce gambling, as inconsistent with this sense of responsibility, both on the part of the rich and the poor. The recognition of the duty of work involves the condemnation of the millionaire whose life is given up to amusement, as much as of the loafer on the street. These doctrines are of the most general application, and they fall directly within the recognized sphere of Christian teaching,

as they have to do with the *inner disposition*, and the godly or the godless attitude of mind in regard to possessions and activities.

It is worth while to point out that such Christian teaching can never come into conflict with economic science. In its older form economic science follows out what will happen on the assumption that each individual is completely self-interested ; in so far as any one chooses to act philanthropically, the conclusions of the science are inapplicable to his case, but they afford no basis for criticizing his conduct, or saying that he ought to have acted differently. In its more modern form economic science analyses the play of motive—the Christian will have a different estimate of “utility” and “disutility” from that of the godless man ; the science may have to correct its view of the normal type from time to time, but the mode of reasoning would remain unaffected.

Whatever practical changes may be introduced, a doctrine which inculcates high personal morality can never be superseded. In a Socialist state there would be external conditions which favoured a different type of character from that which is current to-day, but the necessity of bringing the highest motives into play would still remain. In a Socialistic state all the means of production might be socialized, but the Christian doctrine as to personal use of wages or rations, and as to the personal use of common property and avoidance of waste, would remain. The duty of work would still be a personal duty. In the exposition of traditional Christian teaching as to personal duties there is a very wide field to be dealt with ; and so long as this method is adhered to there is no possibility of conflict either with economic science or with Socialist aspirations.

II

To do these duties is right, and to neglect them is wrong ; so far there need be no difference of opinion. The difficulty arises when we pass from these simple personal duties to duties which involve certain conditions, and which cannot be insisted upon generally and universally. Such a maxim as “give to him that asketh thee” cannot be taken as an absolute rule which prescribes indiscriminate almsgiving—say the distribution of money in Covent Garden Market—as a duty ; that there are implied conditions may be deduced from Scripture itself. “If any man will not work neither shall he eat,” and wherever conditions enter, there must be the weighing of probabilities and the consideration of what is wisest on the whole—what is expedient. The Charity Organization Society

contends that it is wrong to give money unless there is a strong probability that it will be well used ; there are many people who feel that it is right to give men of doubtful antecedents another chance. Different people, who are equally kind-hearted, and equally anxious to relieve the poor, will take different views of duty, especially where the element of time comes in. Some fear that relief of present distress may bring about increased pauperism in times to come. There are many cases in which it is impossible to say that it is certainly a duty to give, and that not to give is wrong.

Similar difficulty attaches under some circumstances to what might have appeared to be simple duties. We feel that it is a duty to pay a man what he earns, not to defraud him of his wages ; and that a man who works should stand on his own feet and not be beholden to charity. But there are many trades in which, from various circumstances, a man cannot earn, by his work, enough to keep him ; the result of his day's work is worth very little. Is he to be paid more than he is worth, and thus have an allowance from charity in addition to his wages ? Shall the sweating go on ? or is the trade to be stamped out, and the man forced into the ranks of the unemployed ? In all such questions considerations of the probable results, and the weighing of present distress against prospective evil, come in. There is no plain and simple duty which will commend itself at once to every earnest and generous man.

Wherever the questions are thus complex, and consideration of probable effects and expediency come in, we are forced to take account of the particular conditions of a particular society ; and it is not the function of the Church to decide what is most expedient at any place or time. In any controversy which arises on such subjects as wages, or the housing of the poor, it is rarely possible to say that one disputant is advocating the Christian course, and that any other course is unchristian. Owing to their difference of standpoint and perspective one Christian man may take one side, and an equally earnest Christian may be found opposing him. Consequently no Christian minister can justly claim the right to lay down the law on such matters, or to assert in God's name what ought to be done, and denounce those who differ from him as unchristian. The pretension to pronounce absolutely on these complex affairs, as if they were simple matters of personal duty, is unfounded ; and those who put forward this claim tend to bring the office of the Christian preacher into discredit, by misusing it. Let me illustrate briefly.

1. It is the duty of the Christian minister to carry on Christ's

work in the world and win men to God, but it is no part of his commission to re-arrange the distribution of external goods, or see that one gets more and another less. Our Lord distinctly declined the part of an arbitrator between brethren, and no bishop can claim on account of his office to be competent to arbitrate between capital and labour in any dispute. It may be that, as a man in his private capacity, he has the requisite technical knowledge and character to be a good arbiter ; but the whole thing lies outside and apart from the duties of his office.

2. The Christian minister, who goes outside the terms of his commission and tries to pronounce authoritatively on the right and wrong of social questions, is likely to be brought into conflict with the exponents of economic science. The philanthropists and the economists have often been in opposition ; in a great many cases the philanthropists have proved themselves to be more nearly right of the two. The economists, in laying down the law in regard to the effect of shortened hours and such matters, have often been quite wrong. But the philanthropists have been mistaken at times ; the granting of allowances in addition to wages was the action of well-meaning and kindly men, but it proved eventually to have been a disastrous policy. The African slave-trade and the Black Problem in America have been the result of following a suggestion made on philanthropic grounds. There are two distinct aspects in which many social problems may be viewed—the immediate pressure of distress, and the effects in the long run of meeting it in some particular way. Wise men can hardly be so certain that they have given sufficient attention to both sides as to be ready to speak with absolute conviction.

3. The Christian minister who pretends to deal authoritatively with social questions is also likely to be brought into hostile relations with Socialists. If, as is likely to be the case, he assumes the maintenance of existing society in some modified form, he will appear, to those who are advocating an entire reconstruction of society, as a half-hearted creature who is content to advocate some temporary and unsatisfactory patchwork. A man who appears to be merely compromising will never win the respect of thoroughgoing and earnest men : they are ready to suspect him of posing as the advocate of a cause which he has not really got at heart. By pretending to deal, as a matter of right and wrong, with complex questions which lie outside his province, the Christian minister is in danger of rousing the prejudices of thinking men and the suspicions of poor men in regard to the religion he professes.

III

This is no imaginary danger. The Church has been discredited in the past by treating absolutely, as matters of right and wrong, what we now see to have been contingent upon circumstances. Two cases may be noticed, one political and the other economic, where the scriptural warrant for the course advocated by Churchmen appeared to be very strong.

1. The terms in which the Kingdom of David is spoken of, in the Old Testament, gave an apparent sanction to monarchy as distinguished from other forms of government; there was excuse for believing that this kind of civil government met with a divine approval to which no other form of constitution could pretend. The first Canon of 1640 insisted on the divine character of monarchy very strongly, and the preachers of the time advocated *active* compliance with the royal demands as a religious duty. There is a general consensus of opinion now that their language was over-strained, and that it was a mistake to bring the influence of the Church to bear so directly on one side in a political dispute; the questions as to the interpretation of the constitution and the limits of monarchical power were not so simple as the Anglicans supposed. Their error of judgement in enforcing what they believed to be civic duty, and treating it as also a religious duty, roused a storm of indignation at the time, and is still felt by many persons to have been discreditable to the Church of England.

2. That the taking of usury is inconsistent with the Christian conception of duty to our neighbours is an opinion which is amply borne out by many passages of the Bible; throughout the early and middle ages much acumen was devoted to the consideration of the subject, and to defining duty in regard to buying and selling, and to monetary transactions, so that a man might be able to carry on his business without any danger of gaining at the expense of others. The changes during the last five hundred years in the manner in which business is conducted—the increase of opportunities for the investment of capital and the development of insurance against risks—have entirely changed business practice in many ways. The ordinary man does not feel that it is wrong to invest money in consols, and the ecclesiastical prohibition of such conduct appears to him to be silly. No churchwarden could ever be expected to present an evildoer of this sort, in accordance with the canon of 1603. There was every possible excuse for treating the prohibition of usury as a simple prohibition of what was plainly wrong; but the change of circumstances has proved that it was a mistake to put it in an absolute form.

3. There is, as it seems to me, far less excuse for the line which so many earnest men are inclined to take in the present day, and for treating the Sermon on the Mount as if it laid down laws which should be supreme in all the relations of life. To regard it as containing absolute rules which should apply to human societies, as well as to individuals personally, appears to me to be giving it an undue extension. I have always regarded it as illustrating by extreme cases the habit of mind which is to be cultivated by those who desire to be good citizens in the Eternal Kingdom of God. Earthly kingdoms, of which the duration and aims are temporal and mundane, do not come directly within its scope. The principles implied in the Sermon on the Mount do not give a basis from which maxims can be deduced for affairs of state. A private person is not to exact vengeance; but a judge is called upon to maintain the authority of the law and to punish a criminal who has broken it. I cannot feel that the magistrate's conduct is unchristian because it is not clear that he loves the criminal as himself, or is doing as he would be done by. A man is not to garnish his common conversation with oaths; but he may be called upon as a citizen to give solemn testimony in a court of justice, according to Article XXXIX. These instances may put us on our guard against any attempt to deduce maxims for human society from principles which are laid down with reference to personal self-discipline. In the complex conditions of modern industry, where international relations are so close and international competition is so keen, it would probably be impossible to insist on the duty of corn-dealers to take a price which should be within the means of the poor,¹ or to insist that clothiers should employ as many hands when trade was bad as they had remunerative work for when trade was good.² These things were seriously attempted by Elizabeth and the Stuarts; it is doubtful whether their efforts did much for the poor, it seems likely that they reacted unfavourably on the attitude of the employing class towards the Crown. The attempt to apply the Sermon on the Mount directly to social conditions appears to me to rest on a misunderstanding of its purport, and to have little prospect of success.

IV

There is a very general feeling among the laity that the clergy are apt to say and do foolish things when they do not mind their own business. It is therefore well for us, as clergy, to be quite clear what is our duty in this matter.

¹ Cunningham, *Growth of English Industry in Modern Times*, 93.

² *Ib.*, 50

1. It is part of our official duty to insist on the duty of work as incumbent upon a Christian man and on the sinfulness of idleness. It is an old complaint against the English clergy that this duty is not sufficiently insisted upon in their preaching. "And the curates of all such villages and towns not considering the word of God, how all people should work to receive their livings of God's gift in right order, as Adam was first put into Paradise that he should work; and Paul saith, 'Who will not work that he eat not.' And he saith every man should work in peace to eat his own meat; that no man should eat away his neighbour's meat, but work to deserve his own meat before he eat it, and that no man for his meat should destroy the works of God. All these texts of God's word the curates never once searched, nor remembered, nor never led their people to such cure."¹

2. It is part of our official duty to remind men of their personal responsibility to God for the use they make of their property; that they are to regard themselves as trustees for Him. In old days when business was, generally speaking, domestic, the man was so much master in his own house that he could be and was held personally responsible for the treatment of his apprentices and journeymen. But in modern times, when the price of his goods fluctuates greatly and he is catering for world-wide markets, when he is no longer protected by municipal custom, but has to face keen competition, there are many matters connected with the conduct of his business that are not in his power. The apparent weakness of Christianity in the face of modern social problems arises from the fact that the man who pays starvation wages does not feel himself to be a free agent in the matter. The sphere of personal responsibility is circumscribed.

3. It may be noticed, however, that while personal economic responsibility is thus narrowed or undermined, personal political responsibility has come to be very widely diffused. There are numberless ways in which the State interferes in economic life, with the aim of securing the welfare of the people. It is part of our official duty to remind men of the seriousness of their political duties, of the wickedness of neglecting them, and above all of the evil of misusing them by trying to turn their political power to personal advantage. The duty of insisting that citizens shall vote for the men and support the measures which they believe will really make for the good of the community, even though it be to their own hindrance, is very real. The higher the tone of political life, the more possible will it be for Parliament or Municipalities, by legisla-

¹ Clement Armstrong (1540) in Pauli, *Drei Denkschriften*.

tion and administrative efficiency, to introduce, as occasion serves, such measures as are expedient for the material welfare of the community. All this can be done without laying stress on any definite policy and without denouncing any party as unchristian. It is not by advocating particular measures as Christian, but by urging the citizens to exercise their privileges, under a sense of responsibility to God, that the Church can rightly use her influence for the good government of a democratic country, and for economic welfare so far as that depends on governmental rather than personal action.

4. So far for the official duty of the clergyman and his teaching in the pulpit, and his conduct in his capacity as charged with the cure of souls. But he has a personal duty as well ; he ought to set an example of being a good citizen, and doing his best in his own parish to keep public bodies up to the mark. The sanitary authorities are quite likely to welcome his evidence about unhealthy houses. The police are glad of help in controlling public-houses, and a well-founded complaint may be of real service. The name of the common informer has fallen into disrepute, because he made personal gain through getting other men punished. It is never likely to be a popular office, even in the case of men whose motives are above suspicion. But a great deal of mischief that now goes on would be checked if some citizen, such as the parish priest, could be counted on to be courageous enough to initiate proceedings against men of any station who are disregarding the laws to the injury of the community.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

J. S. Nicholson, *The Relation of Political Economy to Morality and Christianity*, in *Principles of Political Economy*, III, 427.

C. S. Devas, *Political Economy* (Stonyhurst Philosophical Series).

W. R. Ashley, *An Introduction to English Economic History*, Book I, Chapter iii (Economic Theories and Legislation). Book II, Chapter v (The Relief of the Poor), and Chapter vi (Canonist Doctrine).

W. Cunningham, *The Gospel of Work*.

R. Whateley, *Introductory Lectures on Political Economy*, Lecture II (Relations of the Science to Religion and Morals).

[Published for the Pan-Anglican Congress Committees, who alone are responsible for these Papers.]

SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE.

LONDON : NORTHUMBERLAND AVENUE, W.C.

1908.

Being Problems for consideration at the *Pan-Anglican Congress*, 1908.

THE PRINCIPLES OF STATE INTERFERENCE

By WARWICK H. DRAPER, M.A.

It is not easy to define the questions which seem to arise under the above heading, if we are to consider Legislative Control not merely in relation to capital, but also from the ethical point of view. It is only possible in a brief paper to hint at a few of the topics which suggest themselves. They will doubtless be handled in many divergent ways at the Congress, even if a general consensus is arrived at upon the need of a certain amount of legislative control by the State over individual action and judgement.

The general question of State-action, if as old as Aristotle, lies so close to the roots of all political thinking, and is, with the leave of the Machiavellians, so intimately bound up with the need of some religious sanction, that a greater topic for discussion at this Congress could scarcely be found. We all stand at a moment of time when the echoes of the polemics between Mill, Ricardo, and Herbert Spencer on the one hand, and Burke, Matthew Arnold, Ruskin, and the best of the 'Fabians' on the other, are still sounding in the world we live in. New thinkers and leaders come and go, but the issue is still as unsettled as in the day of the Sermon on the Mount. Discussion and definition, however, will continue to help the progressive development of the social order.

We are probably all agreed that the State, as an organized unit with a long history of gradual evolution, has as its chief material object the more equitable and socially expedient distribution of wealth. Too many are too rich, and too many are too poor. Labour and not riches is the essence of life; it is the quality of the striving, and not the result of the stress, which is the main thing. But the laws of social existence, while they should let us desire a better distribution of the world's wealth, require us to attend to economics and finance, inasmuch as we live in a work-a-day world and cannot enjoy a state of blissful anarchy where each creature is a law unto himself.

It is obvious that, if the true aim of society is the common welfare and moral character of all its members, the interference of the State in its collective wisdom is a necessity. If the phrases we use are to be more than vague catchwords; if capital, whether it be in the hands of merchants or bishops, manufacturers or lawyers—i.e. individuals who know that they have a conscience—or in the control of joint stock companies, of whom that attribute is less certain, is to be fixed with its duties and responsibilities, the State, to some degree, must step in. Hume and Bentham in England established to demonstration the Utilitarian principle of "the greatest happiness of the greatest number". But man has not from their day, as by a jump of

evolution, assumed the uniform character of a model and monotonous altruistic "ego". The world is still a varied and interesting planet, with goals to reach after and injustice to redress. And, if injustice is to be prevented, the collective hand must move and guide. The State has more to do than "merely to perform the duty of a trust-worthy policeman, who keeps the ring for competitive conflicts".

Objections to State-Interference. It is on the question as to what degree of State-Interference may seem expedient at any given moment that opinions widely differ. J. S. Mill's view, expressed in his essay on "Liberty", was that eccentricity should be encouraged, and that "social oppression" was a grave evil. Herbert Spencer's contention that people do not take "political momentum" into account is a good instance of his scientific insight. It can be urged with some force that State-interference frequently brings about unforeseen effects, which cannot easily be remedied just because they are the work of the State; as witness some results of the London Building Act.

State-interference is often mistaken, like individual interference, but is more heavy-handed, as in certain Church persecutions and press-laws. Many instances could be adduced, as in the operations of the Boer War and, most probably, though less sensationally, in the time of peace, of the cumbrousness and inefficiency of State-Departments as contrasted with private industrial concerns; and the experience of the United States, with its multiplication of offices and patronage, illustrates abundantly the difficulty of preventing fraud and corruption.

There remain two further objections which touch still more closely the ethical aspect of Legislative Control, and which the coming Congress will clearly do well to consider in the first place. Human progress, especially in its economic and socialistic phases, and particularly in England, has relied much in the past, and will still continue to rely, on the *practice of voluntary co-operation and the sense of family-responsibility*. The numerous bodies of public utility which are now in active operation, the Garden City Association being a good example, owe their origin and their vitality to the efforts of a few individual volunteers.¹ The behaviour and mental attitude of the executive officers of even such laudable and necessary bodies as Trade Unions frequently warn the student of current politics, especially in England, of the danger which would attend the overloading of the State with functions of government and reform.

Secondly, the logical and complete practice of State-control would most probably weaken *the habit of individual self-reliance*, which, all along the different grades of society, is a source of progress, subtle in operation, but tremendous in its cumulative effects. It is a moral problem of the first order whether a purely democratic régime would exhibit enough self-control to allow free play to individual genius, or whether there would not, on the whole, be a decline both in the happiness and in the nobleness of life. A general level of "dull com-

¹ A subordinate but real moral problem lies in the conundrum whether there would be gain or loss from the managers or directors of these bodies (e.g. co-operative societies administering property) being paid for their work. In a world where labour has to be paid for, better business men might often be attracted, but the attendant risks are grave.

fort and moderate respectability" would be a heavy price to pay for the loss of the art and culture which have always been the fruits of the human struggle. That human nature works from motives is for ever the daily experience of the priest, the doctor, and the lawyer, and it is that experience which inspires the poet, the artist, and the musician. Remove the stimulus of individual or family interest, and, with the leave of the dreamers of "No-where Land" (though we could ill afford to lose their utopias!), what motive would remain for exertion and enterprise, for invention and accumulation, strong enough to induce average men to make a maximum contribution to the general store?

Arguments for State-Interference. But having recognized these very considerable objections, we cannot be blind to the facts of modern progress, which manifest a very large degree of control by Legislative Action. It is impossible to deny that the question is one of the balance of advantages against disadvantages, each act of expediency being subject to certain moral tests. In spite of many ugly features which remain or arise in our present industrial and civic life, who will deny that the poor parts of our towns are less squalid and the conditions of country labour less wretched than a century ago, or that the life of the toiler is blended with more chances of happiness and health? Can a Spencerian who knows the life of the people seriously contend that the mass would at this moment be happier if there had been no Factory Acts, no compulsory inspection of homes and workshops, no Temperance Legislation, no Education Acts, to accompany the growth of population and the invention of machinery? It is a common-place that the majority of the well-to-do people, who have their thinking done for them by their morning paper and mumble odd remarks about "those dreadful Socialists", or deplore that "the country is being ruined" without stirring a finger to save a corner of it, would be astonished to learn for how much their own daily comfort is indebted to actual State-control.

If we glance at a few instances of "interference" in morality and economics, we shall see some problems eminently fit for discussion at a broad-based Conference of the great Christian Society, which can say that its founder seems to have foreseen the essence of them all.

State-Interference in Morality. That no civilized State consistently regards the fostering of morality as outside its sphere is a truism. Individual liberty is theoretically an element in the highest standard of morality, but few of us would really prefer "England free" to "England sober"! We not only lock up drunkards, but we punish even would-be suicides. It is not that in modern times we find that as much "State-drill" can be imposed as Plato and Aristotle recommend or suggest; neither do we make a universal application of the inquisitorial interference of the State into private life. But the fact remains that, in order to enforce public opinion, there is a real educational value in having penal enactments against wrong-doing passed and applied by the State. It is difficult to resist the paradoxical conclusion that the more highly developed a State is, the more widely and firmly will the State intermeddle with the conduct of each citizen, which is three-fourths of his life.

State-Interference in Economics. Extreme socialism says roundly that "property is theft", and that the State alone should possess all land, capital, and machinery, regarded as the means of production. So much injustice is attributable to the abuse of private ownership, that it is easy to explain the wide acceptance of socialistic doctrine and phrases by a generation which has had the benefit of practically universal State-education, and is, as one thankfully admits, carrying social reform as a reality into the arena of actual politics. But the sum of historical experience, and the dangers of discouraging commercial enterprise and of driving capital out of the home-land, all point to the conclusion that private capitalism, given wise and reasonable limitations, remains the best and most practicable method of inducing individuals to contribute to the general wealth. State Socialism, pure and absolute, is calculated not only to reduce the wealth of the world so that it would not "go round", but to undermine the self-respect and independence of the average citizen, and thus to make him morally an inferior man. It would seem that our business is assiduously to see by inspection and all reasonable checks that private ownership is not used to inflict suffering or hardship on a fellow member of the State. If this were done in all the modes of commercial and political economy, how triumphant and beneficent would be the revolution! But it is the most serious of economical questions whether "to teach men to rely upon the State rather than upon their own energies" would not "demoralize the people and sap the strength of the nation, and perhaps destroy the family—the most sacred and beneficent of all social and political institutions". Property is so much an expression of personality that legislative interference with it should be nothing but cautious and deliberate. Such interference should wait upon the success of voluntary effort in industrial organization and upon the success of public opinion in forming habits of personal expenditure.

State-Interference in Education. If the State exists for the well-being of its members, the functions of the State in relation to Education must be extended quite inconsistently with the tenets of the school of "individual liberty". In the encouragement of the arts and sciences outside the ordinary rules of supply and demand, in the use of public money for the children of the poor, and even in the domination by the State-teacher of the personal judgement of both parent and child, we observe to-day the most striking examples of State-interference. With a wiser and bolder use of home-influences, this wide and systematic intervention of the State seems quite desirable.

[Published for the Pan-Anglican Congress Committees, who alone are responsible for these Papers.]

SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE.

LONDON: NORTHUMBERLAND AVENUE, W.C.

1908.

PAN-ANGLICAN PAPERS

Being Problems for consideration at the *Pan-Anglican Congress*, 1908.

SHOULD COMMUNITIES ALONE TO HAVE MONOPOLIES?

MUNICIPAL TRADING

By A. J. CARLYLE, M.A.

CHAPLAIN AND LECTURER OF UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, OXFORD

(*By kind leave of the Christian Social Union*)

THERE has recently been a good deal of excited talk in the newspapers and magazines about the dangerous extent of Municipal Trading ; some people seem to think that this constitutes a very serious danger to private enterprise, and are very much alarmed at what they consider to be the socialistic tendency of such trading. It may therefore be useful to consider some of the actual facts about the amount and character of Municipal Trading, and some of the circumstances which may lead us to welcome rather than to fear its extension.

In the first place it is well to know what Municipal Trading actually is. What is the nature of the trade which is done by the municipalities of the country, and the amount of capital invested? No complete analysis of this has been published since the return made to the House of Commons in 1903, but the *Municipal Year Book for 1907* (p. 635) gives us the total sums invested, and the undertakings in which they are invested, taken from the official returns.

The total amount of capital is, in England and Wales, £195,691,016. A large sum, you will say ! A most alarming and dangerous indebtedness, I can imagine some of our friends exclaiming. Well, I suppose this depends upon the character of the investments. Out of this total, £65,495,976 are invested in waterworks, and £23,283,800 in gasworks. I do not suppose that most people would describe these undertakings as wildly speculative and recklessly unnecessary. Out of the remaining amount £7,637,756 are invested in markets, £41,192,493 in harbours and docks, £2,743,171 in baths and wash-houses, £3,110,275 in burial-grounds ; to these again I suppose few people would object, though it may be regretfully owned, that neither funerals nor washing pay. Then we have £21,636,416 in tramways and light railways, £22,000,567 in the supply of electricity, £8,208,525 in working-class dwellings, and finally £382,037 on other reproductive undertakings.

The table makes it sufficiently clear that the "Reproductive Undertakings" of the municipalities are of a sensible and solid kind, that to talk wildly about dangerous interference with private enterprise is really foolish, and that to describe these investments as the heaping up of an intolerable burden of indebtedness is only to make it clear that the critic is incapable of understanding what he is talking about.

Having thus, I hope, reassured ourselves a little about the actually existing circumstances, we may proceed to consider the economic basis and circumstances of Municipal Trading. In the first place I must ask you to consider what we may call the *economics of monopolies*. It is easy to understand that there are certain undertakings which can in the nature of things only be carried out by one person or firm in any one place. We could not, for instance, have two or three rival companies running different sets of tramway lines through the same streets; a town must give the right to do this to one company, and thus gives this company a monopoly. So with the supply of gas or water or electricity. The supply of such things can usually only be carried out under conditions of monopoly, and *monopolies are best under the immediate control of the community*. If you ask for the reason of this, the reply is very simple. The holder of a monopoly, so long as he can make his profit, has no special inducement to consider the convenience of the public. If we don't like the boots which we get at our boot-makers we go to another, but if we don't find our tramways convenient, or are dissatisfied with the character and conditions of our water supply, we may have no remedy. The holder of a monopoly will indeed always make such improvements as he feels sure will bring him in a larger profit, but if the public convenience requires a larger outlay of capital which will not bring in a larger proportion of profit, or the financial results of which are at all uncertain, the monopolist will not carry this out. His object is profit, while the public wishes convenience.

It is therefore obvious that the public should directly and immediately control all large undertakings which supply things of public necessity or convenience, and which have the character of monopolies. If you will now turn back to our examination of the returns, you will see that the greater part of the undertakings there dealt with have this character.

We have thus dealt with the circumstances which make Municipal Trading, as we now know it, desirable and even necessary: we may now go on to consider certain characteristics of industry which indicate that the public control and management of industry can be, and will probably need to be, greatly extended. And first we may inquire as to the economical possibility of doing this.

It was generally assumed in economic works that industry is best carried on under the terms of competition for profit, that it is by means of this competition that industrial methods have advanced, and that the customer has found his convenience consulted. It is often suggested that the salaried official of a public business could have no such powerful stimulus to personal efficiency, and that therefore the substitution of public for private ownership and control would prove economically ruinous to any society. Before we give our assent to such a judgement, it is well to observe some of the actual characteristics of *modern industry*.

Nothing is more characteristic of modern industry than the tendency towards the substitution of the joint stock company for the old private firm. In every department of industry this process is taking place. It is possible that this change may be accompanied by some loss of industrial efficiency, but what is quite certain is that the transition is itself

the result of the operation of economic forces. For our purpose it is surely of importance to take account of this fact, and to observe how the direction of industry is in a large measure passing into the hands of salaried officials. As I have said, it is quite possible that the change has involved some loss of industrial efficiency in some directions, but no one seriously maintains that industry is being ruined by it. The truth is, no doubt, that besides the economical advantages which belong to the greater scale on which production is carried on, the advantage derived from the direct stimulus of profit under the old system may be more than counterbalanced by the greater skill and intelligence which is at the service of the joint stock companies.

It is indeed probable that there may always be a difference between the more speculative and the normal productive enterprise, that the more speculative form of industry will continue to depend largely upon the initiative and enterprise of individual men who are directly interested in the possible profits of such concerns. But it must be remembered that while we can draw no fixed line between the speculative and the normal business of a community, the former is only a part and the smaller part of the industry of the country. *It is, then, clear that in the organization of industry the salaried official is tending to take the place of the owner.* It cannot therefore be seriously maintained that it is impossible for industrial concerns which are controlled or owned by the public to find efficient servants.

It remains to consider certain characteristics of industry which seem to indicate that it may prove necessary to extend the public control over at least some of the important forms of industry. We have just seen that the private firm is giving way to the joint stock company. It is, I think, true to say that the company competing with other companies in one industry is tending to give place to the great combination which is sometimes called a *Trust or Syndicate*, the great combination which includes all, or nearly all, the firms engaged in one industry in a country. The causes which seem to be producing this tendency are complex, and we cannot now enter into them, but undoubtedly one most important cause lies in the unexpected results which have actually attended the working of competition in industry. It is, I think, true to say that in many industries these great combinations have been formed because the firms conducting that business were ruining each other and themselves in the frenzied struggle of competition, by underselling each other. Underselling is a ruinous business when the price is reduced below the cost of production, and one cannot wonder that the longer-headed men among the leaders of industry have recognized that combination would often work far better, at least for the producer, than competition. It is true that it is in the United States, and under the shelter of high protective duties, that the Trusts have been most developed, but the economic forces which have produced them there are at work in this country also. These great combinations will, just in proportion to their success, tend to become a *possible source of danger to the community*. It may only be in highly protectionist countries that they can attain the position of complete monopolies, but even in Free Trade

countries a completely organized combination, including the whole of one trade, will tend to have this character ; and therefore *in the interests of the community they may need to be in a large measure under public control.*

I have thus endeavoured to point out that there are circumstances in the organization of industry at the present day which seem to show that in the near future we may require greatly to extend the public control over those great industries which are specially necessary to the public well-being ; and I have already pointed out that the notion that public control or ownership of industrial concerns will necessarily cause them to be inefficient and unproductive, rests upon an assumption which is not warranted by the facts, and that *we may look forward without any great economical anxiety to a great development of municipal and other public enterprises in the future.*

It remains, however, true that such changes in the industrial organization will throw new and heavy burdens upon those who are charged with the care of our municipal affairs, will bring with them new responsibilities, and new temptations, indeed the risk of such changes lies rather in the moral than in the economical region. Our municipal institutions have not always been as wholly free from suspicion as might have been wished : the danger of corruption will be increased with the extension of municipal trading.

The progress of society will not, however, stand still while we stand nervously and anxiously on one side. Our task is surely to do all that lies in us to set forward such an increased sense of responsibility, of the sacred obligation of public service, that men of religion and of honour may recognize the call to serve God in the service of our cities and counties. *There is no task which is more directly laid upon us than that of working for the true appreciation by Christian men of the obligation of the public service ;* there is no service which we can render to our country and our generation greater than that of setting forward a higher spirit, a nobler sense of the obligations and the responsibilities of public life.

[Published for the Pan-Anglican Congress Committees, who alone are responsible for these Papers.]

SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE.

LONDON: NORTHUMBERLAND AVENUE, W.C.

1908.

INDIA AND ENGLAND

SOME MORAL ASPECTS OF THE ECONOMIC RELATION

BY THE REV. C. F. ANDREWS, M.A., DELHI

IN India, economic problems arise out of the relation with England, because

- (i) India is ruled from England.
- (ii) The English Government is, in a real sense, the landlord and landowner of India.
- (iii) Departments directed by English officials deal with a very large amount of the daily life and interests of the people of India.
- (iv) The English Government in India is bound by close economic ties with England in regulating its own fiscal policy.

It should be stated clearly at the outset that the leading Indian economists acknowledge the moral and material benefit which has come to India through British Rule. To mention the two most celebrated, Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji begins his book, entitled *Poverty and Un-British Rule in India*, with a tribute to the "advanced, humanitarian civilization of Britain" in India; Mr. Romesh Chander Dutt, C.I.E., both in his *Economic History* and in *India in the Victorian Age*, points out the gains of peace and settlement and education which have been derived from the British Raj. They criticize what they regard as blemishes in an otherwise beneficial and progressive system. Mr. Naoroji was for many years a Member of Parliament; Mr. Dutt, a retired member of the Indian Civil Service, is at present working on an important Government Commission. A new extremist school of Indian economic thinkers has recently arisen. Their principles will be dealt with separately at the end of this paper.

There are four main subjects on which Indian economists raise the moral issue with regard to the relation between India and England—

- (i) English predominance acting as a deterrent to initiative, enterprise and leadership. (Mr. Naoroji calls this "The moral poverty of India".)
- (ii) The drain from India of wealth to England in "Home charges".
- (iii) The economic advantages given to England in the past and present Indian fiscal systems.

(iv) The heavy incidence of the Land Revenue, causing agricultural depression and distress.

(i) ENGLISH PREDOMINANCE.

"Subjection," says Seeley, "for a long time to a foreign yoke is one of the most potent causes of national deterioration." Is this true of India? Mr. Naoroji would answer that, while in many directions India has undoubtedly advanced, in one direction there has been a most serious moral and economic loss. The predominance of a superior race has crushed Indian initiative, and in consequence the new civilization has been imposed from without, rather than developed from within. In Japan the advance in the new civilization has been from within—organic, assimilative, self-achieved. In India the Government (like all great alien patrons who attempt to regulate from without) tends to keep in leading strings and pauperize its clients by making them too dependent on its bounty. The steady pressure of a foreign superiority, which is never absent, has carried with it a steady contraction of innate powers among those who are in an inferior position, and thus has tended to bring about that national deterioration of which Seeley speaks. The whole system of Government administration is necessarily foreign, and Indians are obliged to adapt themselves laboriously to foreign ways. Even when they succeed, they can only fill inferior positions and remain in subordination to foreigners. Mr. Naoroji would add that this does not apply to Government service alone. The very qualities of independence, initiative and originality, which are most needed in modern commerce, have had little scope for development among educated Indians, and enterprising English traders and speculators have been able to take advantage of the weak condition of the country and exploit its economic resources. They have also had the immense advantage of belonging to the ruling race, and have used that advantage to the full. Indians under these conditions have remained subordinates and inferiors, not only in the large area of Government employment, but also in the still larger area of modern trade and business enterprise. This position of continual inferiority to the Englishman has been rendered all the more unbearable, because it has happened in direct contradiction to the different charters which pledged impartial treatment. The pledges given as early as 1833 have never been fulfilled. The Queen's Proclamation itself remains in this matter almost a dead letter. The Act of Parliament of 1870 shared a similar fate. The Resolution carried by the House of Commons in 1893 to hold simultaneous examinations for the

Civil Services has never been put into effect. Thus, in addition to the actual evil of Indians remaining in inferior positions, there is the added evil of broken promises.

An answer to this is not easy. Perhaps the strongest position is to claim that in India it is better to proceed slowly and cautiously, even with the acknowledged evil of foreign predominance and with the appearance of breaking promises, than to make one false step which would throw all back ; that greater responsibilities are gradually passing into Indian hands, and meanwhile a peaceful internal revolution is taking place, whereby Indian castes and races and creeds are being welded into a nation. But such an answer in the past has been only too often a cover for selfishness, and the general tone of Anglo-Indian opinion is constantly intolerant of racial equality. Against this spirit the Church should raise no uncertain voice.

(ii) THE HOME CHARGES.

It will be best to state this complaint against the present administration in the words of Mr. R. C. Dutt, C.I.E. : " One-fourth of all the revenues derived in India is annually remitted to England in Home charges, and if we add to this the portion of their salaries which European officers employed in India annually remit to England, the total annual drain exceeds twenty million pounds sterling. The richest country on earth stoops to levy this annual contribution from the poorest. Those who earn £42 per head ask for 10s. per head from a nation earning £2 per head. And this 10s. per head impoverishes Indians, and therefore impoverishes British trade with India. The contribution does not benefit British commerce, while it drains the life blood of India in a continuous, ceaseless flow. For when taxes are raised and spent in a country, the money comes back to the country ; but when taxes, raised in a country, are remitted out of it, the money is lost to the country for ever ; it does not stimulate her industries or trades, or reach the people in any form. Over twenty millions are annually drained from the revenues of India, and it would be a miracle if such a process, continued through long decades, did not impoverish even the richest nation upon earth."

When this statement is examined it is found to be a very imperfect representation of the facts. Considerably more than half of the sum that Mr. Dutt describes as the annual drain is due to interest on capital invested in India, which has proved for the most part a reproductive investment. By the irrigation system, for instance, for which State loans were raised, nineteen million acres of land, which were practically desert, have been

brought under fertile cultivation. Railways are now helping, by their profits, to add to the revenue of India ; they are an untold boon to the country and a protection against famine. Yet they could not have been built without English capital. Instances such as these, of reproductive loans both in money and in men, could be multiplied. The value of a first-rate scientist or a first-rate engineer, introducing improvements into India which will last for centuries, cannot be measured by a monthly income of a thousand odd rupees.

On the other hand the claim is unquestionably just that such a large amount as twenty millions taken every year out of the country must be a financial strain of the most serious character, and everything should be done to lighten that strain. For India is like no other great country in the world, in that most of her rulers and merchant princes make their fortunes within her borders, but do not spend them there. Wherever, therefore, an Indian can replace an Englishman, without the work suffering or the stability of the Government of the country being impaired, the benefit to India is both moral and material :—moral, because another Indian has become a recognized leader in his own country ; material, because the wealth that the Indian accumulates will be circulated in India, not in England.

In this connexion one of the biggest items of expenditure is the Standing Army. Education remains, year by year, in an almost starved condition on account of the enormous military expenditure. The plea is just that, if India was able to spare for a long period 30,000 English troops for South Africa, when Russia was strong and there was no Anglo-Russian Convention, she can spare at least 5,000 to-day. Even such a reduction would release sufficient funds for the crying need of primary education. The plea is also just that the present expenditure in all the services is uncontrolled by Indians themselves, and that taxation without representation is bound to be extravagant.

(iii) FISCAL INJUSTICE.

It is argued that in the early years of the Nineteenth Century everything possible was done by England (without any protest or retaliation from the Indian Government) to crush Indian manufactures, especially those of cotton and silk, for which India was famous : that, on account of this policy, India was reduced to an almost purely agricultural condition, her own manufactures being replaced in her own markets by those of Lancashire. It is shown further how, in modern days, when an attempt was being made to revive the cotton industry, and a very slight import duty was levied for the purposes of revenue,

Lancashire forced the British Parliament to insist on an excise duty (equivalent to the import duty) being placed on all Indian cotton goods. "There shall be levied at every mill in British India upon all cotton goods a duty at the rate of $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent." (Cotton Duties Act, 1896). Even though it was pointed out that there was no competition whatever with Lancashire in the coarser cloths, which formed the bulk of Indian manufacture, yet so great was the trade jealousy that an excise duty was forced upon non-competing goods as well as on competing goods. "As an example," says Mr. Dutt, "of fiscal injustice, the Indian Act of 1896 is unexampled in any civilized country in modern times. Indian cottons which were supposed to compete with imported goods were first excised in 1894. The Indian goods which did not compete were excised in 1896. Such is the manner in which the interests of an unrepresented nation are sacrificed."

To this statement there is very little answer to be made. It is true that the early Indian hand-loom manufactures would have died a natural death in any case, after the advent of the power-loom in England, but there is the clearest evidence¹ that the relentless application of high protective tariffs in England, combined with every encouragement given to Lancashire goods in India, helped to kill them. With regard to the present Cotton Excise Duty, which taxes Indian manufactures at Indian factory gates before they can be sold even in India, I have never heard a word of justification or defence, and more than one high English official has told me that he regarded it as "iniquitous". Its imposition gives colour to the saying prevalent to-day in India—that the moment the present Swadeshi movement touches English pockets, the whole weight of England will be brought to bear to crush it, and India will be treated in trade matters as a conquered country with no rights and privileges. In the last two years it has been the economic even more than the political dependence of India upon England which has given strength to "Extremism".

One further word needs to be added. Indian economists have protested from early days against the wrong done to China by the Indian opium revenue. As early as 1880, Mr. Naoroji, in a memorandum addressed to the Secretary of State for India, wrote as follows:—"In England no statesman dares to propose that opium may be allowed to be sold in public-houses. On the contrary, Parliament enacts that 'opium be sold by certified chemists only and be distinctly labelled "poison"'. And yet, at the other end of the world, this Christian and humane England forces a 'heathen' and 'barbarous' Power

¹ See *Evidence taken before the Commons Committee*, 1832, vol. ii.

to take this poison. This opium trade is a sin on England's head, and a curse on India for her share in being the instrument." Mr. Gokhale and others have spoken out no less openly. This great fiscal question, involving the gravest moral responsibilities, is not yet settled, and it is a matter of thankfulness that the recent Indian Episcopal Synod has spoken out so bravely.

(iv) AGRICULTURAL DEPRESSION.

The frequent recurrence of famine, in spite of railway and irrigation improvements, has made Indian economists ask for a revision of policy with regard to the Land Revenue. It should be stated that Government acts as legal owner of the soil, and takes from it a revenue amounting to about 50 per cent. of the net assets (*Imperial Gazetteer*, vol. iv, p. 222). This charge upon the land is revised every twenty or thirty years, and enhanced as the land rises in value. In Bengal, however, a "Permanent Settlement" was made in 1793, by which the land revenue should remain stationary. It is claimed that, if such a permanent settlement were extended to the whole of India, the evils of constant "settlements" would be avoided, accumulation and investment of capital would be encouraged, and the peasantry would be more able to withstand the effects of a bad season. The answer to such a demand for permanent settlements seems to be that the time for such a change of policy is past, and that more difficulties would now be created than solved. The true path of progress appears to lie in a completely scientific adjustment, which will allow for remission in seasons of scarcity, foster efforts made to improve the land, and take full account of local conditions.

A further criticism of the present system is contained in the complaint that it leads to an unequal distribution of wealth, the poor growing poorer in spite of their acknowledged industry and frugality. The new wealth that is flowing into the country tends to accumulate in the hands of the trading classes, who are very lightly taxed; while the burden of taxation is borne by the peasantry. The agricultural classes are more and more exploited by the traders, and their ignorance makes such exploitation doubly difficult to avoid. Up to the present only the most meagre efforts have been made, and the most meagre sums of money expended, in order to give them primary education, and thus put them on more equal terms with the money-lender. Though "the most patient and frugal peasantry in the world", (*Imperial Gazetteer*, vol. iv, p. 204) they are weighed down by debt and sink almost at the first touch of famine.

When it is stated officially that, in 1878, the excess mortality

from famine reached 5,250,000 in British territory alone, and that in July, 1900, famine relief was administered daily to 6,500,000 persons (*Imperial Gazetteer*, vol. iii, pp. 489 and 492), and further that the Indian peasantry are "the most patient and frugal in the world", and then the information is given that the Land Revenue, taken from the same peasantry, amounts approximately to 50 per cent. of the net assets, the ordinary reader cannot help but feel that there is something wrong with the conditions, though he may not be able to point out a remedy. It can hardly be regarded as a sufficient solution of the problem to point to highly organized State agencies for famine relief. Even if excessive mortality is avoided, the danger of pauperization remains. The question needs continually to be asked whether, by reduction of military expenditure¹ or other methods, the burden of land taxation cannot be further lightened, and at the same time, whether the abysmal ignorance of the peasantry as to the uses of money and the powers of co-operation cannot be dispelled. The issues of life and death are so vast, and the possibilities of human suffering so immense (a famine area not seldom includes over 50,000,000 people), that the economic question is raised to the highest pitch of importance.

A new school of Indian economists, sometimes called by the name of "Extremists", has gained ground in recent years. The main doctrine of the new school may be summed up in the word "Boycott". The exponents of this doctrine declare that only in holding aloof from Government altogether lies economic salvation. To be dependent on a foreign Government for education and employment, and even indirectly (by buying English goods) for food and clothing, is to become a "mendicant" and to join the throng of educated Indians who are sinking lower and lower in pauperizing subjection. The leaders of the new party therefore advocate a policy of "thorough" (whence their name "Extremists"), and endeavour to organize Indian life apart from Government influences. They attempt a new form of education unaided by Government grants; they boycott all English goods; they avoid Government Law Courts in settling their disputes; they refuse altogether Government service. In this way they hope to train a younger generation in "Swaraj" or Self-Government. It is possible that such a complete programme may not be carried out by any large section of the community under present circumstances. At the same time the spirit of self-dependence and indigenous development, in a form which is termed "Swadeshi" (lit.

¹ In 1904-5 the military expenditure (£20,000,000) very nearly equalled the combined Land and Salt taxes.

“one’s own country”), is spreading very widely indeed and reaching the masses of the people. A whole series of new economic and moral problems will have to be faced by a Church in India that aspires to be called National.

Compare — *Imperial Gazetteer of India*, vols. iii and iv (Clarendon Press, Oxford.) *Land Revenue Policy of the Government of India*. (Arnold, London.) D. Naoroji, *Poverty and un-British Rule in India*. (Sonnenschein, London.) R. C. Dutt, *Economic History of British India, 1757–1837*. (Thacker Spink, Calcutta.) *India in the Victorian Age*. (Thacker Spink, Calcutta.) *Indian Trade, Manufactures and Finance*. (Elm Press, Calcutta.) T. Morison, *Industrial Organization of an Indian Province*. (Murray, London.) J. Rowntree, *The Imperial Drug Trade*. (Methuen, London.) Yusuf Ali, *Life and Labour in India*. (Murray, London.) *Government Accounts, Revenue Returns, &c.*, may be obtained from the Superintendent of Government Printing, Calcutta, India. They are the most useful source of statistical information.

[Published for the Pan-Anglican Congress Committees, who alone are responsible for these Papers.]

SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE.

LONDON: NORTHUMBERLAND AVENUE, W.C.

1908.

PAN-ANGLICAN PAPERS

Being Problems for consideration at the *Pan-Anglican Congress*, 1908.

CHRISTIANITY AND SOCIALISM

BY THE RIGHT REV. CHARLES GORE, D.D., BISHOP OF
BIRMINGHAM

SOCIALISM, STRICTLY CONSIDERED

SOCIALISM, in its strict sense, describes a certain economic theory, viz. that for the present system of private capital should be substituted collective ownership by the State or community of all the sources and instruments of production and distribution. At present, land, factories, and capital generally belong to private owners or combinations of private owners: and the labourer is dependent for employment and subsistence upon the private owners, and their competition to enrich themselves largely determines the conditions of employment. For this system the Socialist would substitute collective ownership of all that constitutes capital, of all the sources and instruments of production and distribution, by the State or community, in the equal interest of all—with an equal obligation upon all of co-operative labour, and an equal claim by all upon the produce of labour, according to the value of the labour and the need of each. In the socialistic community there would be no distinction of employers and employed. The community would be the sole employer and the members of the community would be its salaried servants.

Such is the essence of the various socialistic theories: and remote as the establishment of any fully socialistic State may at the present moment be, the ideal is so prominently before the minds of men, and there is so much aspiration in this direction, that Christianity is bound to consider its relation to the socialistic idea.

Our present object is not to discuss whether State Socialism is practicable: it is to consider what attitude Christianity must adopt towards it supposing it practicable.

There are, of course, various degrees or kinds of Socialism. And we may clear the ground by some preliminary distinctions. Thus:—

1. There are Socialists who would treat men as members of the State and nothing else. They would destroy the family, and the bond of indissoluble marriage; and make the breeding and rearing of children a purely State function. Christianity can, of course, only wage war against such a Socialism. It must claim that man is something besides a member of a State. It must claim the (practical) liberty of the family relation and family life.

2. Many Socialists, making the State all in all, would seem to refuse liberty for the development of religion, or art, or science, or knowledge, except so far as the State might recognize its usefulness and support its votaries. All men must be State-employés and nothing else. This would hideously dwarf and enslave human life. But it is quite compatible with the main theory of Socialism to allow men to exist in the State who are not State officials or employés, but are pursuing ends not regulated by the State, as artists, or writers, or teachers, or priests; so long as there were other men, labouring for the State, who were prepared to maintain them, as they do at present, with a share of their earnings. Thus a socialistic State is compatible with voluntary associations, and officers for such associations, existing to enlarge or develop the life of man in ways not brought within the cognizance of the State. Here again Christianity must stand jealously for human liberty against the narrowness and materialism of much socialistic theory.

3. Many Socialists use "levelling" language about equal wages and equal education for all—language which seems to ignore the vast inequalities of faculty, and considerable inequalities of need among men. The manager, the organizer, the thinker, the teacher, the high official, have needs in the way of leisure, house room, &c., which the ordinary worker has not. And the well-being of society depends upon the exceptional man being given the opportunity to realize his exceptional faculty.

But Socialism as a theory is not bound up with the hostility to the Christian idea of marriage, or with materialistic narrowness, or the ignoring of the conditions of free personal development. And leaving aside for the moment those tendencies which often accompany Socialism, but are not to be identified with it, and concerning myself only with the socialistic theory strictly conceived, I would lay it down that, on the other hand, there is nothing in the socialistic idea of the constitution of society which is antagonistic to Christianity, and that its main idea is closely allied to the Christian idea; but that, on the other hand, Christianity must remain independent: as of other organizations of society, so also of State Socialism. For Christianity is to work in all stages of social organization, finding itself more in harmony with one than with another: but in all alike inspiring men with the consciousness and power of divine sonship and human brotherhood, in the spirit of Jesus of Nazareth, by means and methods which are always distinct from, or ought always to be distinct from, the political and social organization in which for the time it finds itself engaged. If a socialistic State should be organized, or come into working existence, it will need, as much as any previous stage of society, the pressure within it of the independent Christian forces: for Socialism will make a far deeper demand on character than most of its adherents realize. It may be true that "collectivism" will remove many of the temptations to selfishness and corruption which at present tarnish our political and social life; but it will substitute other temptations quite as perilous. It is not too much to

say that an experiment in State Socialism, based on the average level of human character as it exists at present, would be doomed to disastrous failure: and, even if the average level of character should gradually rise with the new conditions, still it is quite certain that the tendency to mediocrity or materialism in the collectivist State would be very obvious; and the "salt" which Christianity can supply in the way of motives to unselfishness, and self-sacrifice, and personal purity: to unworldly devotion and spiritual zeal: to enthusiasm and love for God and for man, including the men and women who are weak and diseased and socially useless, would be as much needed as in any state of society known or conceivable in our present world.

THE MOTIVES OF SOCIALISM

But after all we have no socialistic State in existence, or near to coming into existence. What we have is a great body of aspiration towards Socialism, more or less vaguely conceived, and legislative measures being passed or contemplated under the pressure of this socialistic tendency. This is a great force actually at work in the present. The future—whereunto all this will grow—is uncertain, and the expected does not generally happen. But the present movement is an undoubted fact, and with the motives and aspirations of this "current Socialism" Christianity is very vitally concerned, for they are ethical, and involve a certain idea of human brotherhood.

The socialistic movement is based upon a great demand for justice in human life. It notes the injustice in the actual division of the profits of industry, both present and inherited. It notes the enormous wealth, and aimless luxury, and reckless expenditure upon amusement and display at the "West End" of cities: and towards the other end of the social scale the vast and monotonous areas of workmen's houses in which labour is gaining a bare and precarious subsistence, passing down into abject poverty and unemployment, oppressed by the sense of powerlessness and hopelessness. It notes the multitude of men and women, lads and girls, whose lives are dwarfed and stunted by unhappy conditions, without any real prospect of making the best of their faculties. It notes the hopeless prospect of old age; and the awful disproportion between the infant mortality in the rich and poor districts of great cities. Again, it notes the decay of the country life: the land in few hands: the great houses with the luxurious "week ends" and shooting parties, with the bitter contrast of poverty and hopelessness in the dwindling population of agricultural labourers. It may be said that in the picture, drawn in such lurid colours, much is left out and much ignored that ought to be considered. But when all that can legitimately modify the picture has been introduced, the contrast remains real and startling enough. The indictment of our present social organization is indeed overwhelming.

And with the indictment Christianity ought to have the profoundest sympathy. It is substantially the indictment of the prophets.

They lived in an age when the land of Israel was passing from the peasant proprietors to the great owners, who "added house to house and field to field": when direct access to the soil, the chief capital of the country, was thus passing into few hands: when labour was becoming dependent, and was being exploited and sweated by its masters. Thus there was luxury at one end of society and poverty at the other. And the denunciation of this state of society is their constant and almost monotonous theme. God, they proclaim and insist, is on the side of the poor. He is the God of the helpless. To exact labour without paying a sufficient wage to the labourer is to offend God. Luxury and the accumulation of property is denounced, while manual labour is held in honour. The prophets are content to present the broad picture, with its broad contrasts, without qualifying considerations; and they claim that God's will must be done: that the law of justice must be practically recognized: or that God will judge and punish His people for the injustice of society. This is at first their main theme. And if personal religion, as in the Psalms, tends to take a more prominent place in Jewish teaching, it does not override the social aspect of religion. "For the comfortless troubles' sake of the needy, and because of the deep sighing of the poor, I will up, saith the Lord."¹

Broadly, then, in the struggle of the rich and the poor, though doubtless then as now the faults were not only on the side of the rich, the prophets of Israel are on the side of the poor.

When our Lord came, He moved about freely among rich and poor, teaching men by word and example that God was their Father and all they were brethren, teaching them to live neighbourly and brotherly one with another. He did not shrink from intercourse with the rich, or from the imputation brought by such free intercourse—that he was "a gluttonous man and a wine-bibber, the friend of publicans and sinners"; but it is impossible to deny that His sympathy was with the poor: that he was on the side of the poor: that His warnings and denunciations are mainly directed against wealth, and the desire of wealth, and the love of the power which comes with wealth and position: and that He could see no life weakened and depressed by the selfishness of power and wealth without indignation.

Now, in our present social organization, with all its manifest "crushing" of weak lives, and "grinding of the faces of the poor", where has been the fire of prophetic indignation in the Church, which yet exists to represent Christ and the Bible? It has found occasional expression through individual churchmen, or groups of churchmen, a Lord Shaftesbury, a Maurice, a Kingsley, a Westcott, and others still living. But how utterly, on the whole, has the official Church, or the main body of the Church, failed to exhibit the prophetic spirit!

This, then, is the first great claim we make upon the Church to-day: that it should make a tremendous act of penitence for having failed so long and on so wide a scale to behave as the champion of the op-

¹ Ps. xii. 5.

pressed and the weak : for having tolerated what it ought not to have tolerated : for having so often been on the wrong side. And the penitence must lead to reparation while there is yet time, ere the well-merited judgements of God take all weapons of social influence out of our hands.*

There are two pleas in extenuation of our blindness which may be briefly noted :—

(1) "We have administered much charitable relief. We have tried hard as a church to pick up the sick and wounded in the social struggle." This is quite true : and it is something. But all observers are agreed as to the ineffectiveness on a large scale of our "ambulance work." And, what is much more important, the Christian church was created to be no mere ambulance corps, but the organ of the kingdom of God in the world : the power of positive and militant righteousness : the vindicator and defender of the weak : the irresistible foe of oppression and injustice. And how vast has been our failure !

(2) "We were but paying a respectful attention to the political economy which warned us off from trying to interfere with the laws of supply and demand, or with the individual's liberty to sell his labour for what he could get for it in the open market." But why did we prefer the voice of the economists to the voice of the prophets and of Christ ? Why did we refuse to believe the voices of the prophets which told us in plain language that a sweated industry was an iniquity in God's sight, and that the first charge upon industry is the proper payment of the labourer ? Why were we so slow to listen to those who would have encouraged us still to trust the voice of Christ—whether it were Maurice or Kingsley within the Church or Carlyle or Ruskin without it ? Now the wheel of science has turned round and we are left to discover either that we misunderstood the economists, or that their economic doctrine was mistaken.¹

We have, then, no effective plea to advance against the accusation that the Church as a body failed to champion the cause of the weak and the oppressed. Our only present plea is effective repentance. We must identify ourselves with the great impeachment of our present industrial system. We must refuse to acquiesce in it. But more than this, we must identify ourselves, because we are Christians, with the positive ethical ideal of socialistic thought.

¹ See the address of Professor Ashley, President of the Economic Section of the British Association, at Leicester, this summer (1907). "Thus it is that we can now say—and expect general acquiescence—what twenty years ago would have called forth loud protest, and would, indeed, have been premature; and that is, that the first phase of economics as a systematic study in this country is now well over; that the orthodox economics of the middle of the nineteenth century has for some time been quite dead. We shall differ, unquestionably, as to its value, both as an intellectual construction and as an instrument of social and political change; we shall differ, perhaps, as to the relation to it of that present-day teaching which some will deem a natural outgrowth from the old, others its very antithesis. But about the fact of its departure we shall all be agreed. No economist of any reputation in this country, or in America, or in Germany, when left to himself, lays stress now on the propositions which Ricardo and his school emphasized; nor does he draw the same conclusions as to practical policy."

III

THE ETHICAL IDEAL OF SOCIALISM

Broadly we may contrast two ideals of society: the one which is called individualism—which is based upon the right of the individual, which means always, in the long run, the right of the strong—and the other which is called Socialism (in the general sense), which is based on the idea that the society and the interest of the society, and all its members, is supreme over the individual. Doubtless these two ideals are both abstract and require modification. The free ethical development of the individual is necessary for the welfare of society, and the society which refuses to allow scope for free individual development will defeat its own ends. Doubtless also different elements in social development require emphasis at different times. But the two ideals remain. And Dr. Westcott was surely right in maintaining that on the whole Christianity is with Socialism, and not individualism: that is to say, the Christian ideal represents men as members of a body bound, from first to last, to have regard to the interests of others equally with their own: bound, every one of them, to labour and to service. It would have men honoured not in virtue of how much they have made for themselves, but how much they have contributed to the common good. It would bind men to regard all their faculties and acquisitions as a trust for the whole community. It would pledge men, as members of one body, to acknowledge the weakness or suffering of any single member as the weakness or suffering of all.

Positively, then, the Christian thinker and preacher, captain of industry and worker, politician and voter, must labour to substitute, through the whole fabric of our ideas and our practical system, this idea of social obligation and fellowship, for the mere assertion of individual liberty, and of the rights of property, on which we have been accustomed to base our social system.

The day may come when a legitimate individualism will be imperilled. At present it is a rampant and excessive individualism which has to be brought under the control of the community and of the common interest. And with the spirit of this socializing movement the Christian must be altogether in sympathy.

It will affect his duty as an individual—as worker, capitalist, employer and consumer. Thus as *worker* he will acknowledge neither in himself nor in any man the right to be idle. As a *capitalist* or *employer* he will accept it as “the fundamental Christian principle of the remuneration of labour that the first charge upon any industry must be proper maintenance of the labourer—an idea which it has been sought to express in popular language by the phrase, “the living wage”¹. As a *consumer* he will acknowledge “that no Christian has a right to demand commodities at a price which he knows, or can ascertain, to be incompatible with the adequate remuneration of the worker and proper conditions of industry”².

¹ Report of Joint Committee of Convocation (see below) p. 5.

² p. 6.

But the mere individual is powerless by himself, or by any voluntary association, to alter what is amiss. For the support of the individual the ideal must be also in great measure embodied in the law. Thus the Christian must be on the side of the social law, so far as the law goes at present; and as citizen and as himself sharing in public work, must give it his energetic and intelligent support. At present most churchmen or churchwomen have—as the membership of our public bodies would show—a very feeble sense of their duty as citizens. (In particular, to mention one point only, our district visitors and other churchworkers might do much to help the State and city if they were better instructed in the rudiments of industrial and sanitary law.)

Lastly the Christian must not be content with our law as it stands: he must co-operate vigorously with all men of goodwill for legislative reform. "It is time, we think, that the Christian conscience of the country voted urgency among parliamentary and municipal questions for all the group of problems which concern the grossly unequal distribution of wealth and well-being; the waste of life and capacity through lack of proper nourishment and training; the sweating of women's and children's labour; the deficiency, in the surroundings of so many, of those things which are the ordinary essentials of physical and moral well-being".³

In thus claiming that the Christian should, because he is a Christian, co-operate with the ideal which men like Dr. Westcott have called Socialist, it is not of course intended that Christians or churchmen should tie themselves to any one political party, or should behave as partisans of any one class. Nor is it intended to deny that men may hold the Socialist ideal, as Dr. Westcott held it, and still hold somewhat different views as to how far, or on what lines, the legislative power of the State can be invoked, without impairing the sense of individual initiation and individual responsibility. Here it is intended only to claim that Christians should be at pains to be true to what is the fundamental idea of social life in Christianity, the idea which is meant to have its first application in the life of the Church, and its further application in the life of the secular society, so far as either we can claim that the nation is a Christian nation, or the nation is ready, under whatever name, to acknowledge the moral and social ideal of Christianity.

These brief remarks, so manifestly incomplete, are intended in their circumscribed limits to assist and even provoke discussion at the Pan-Anglican Congress: and doubtless their manifest inadequacy at many points will be supplied by other readers and speakers.

³ p. 7.

[Published for the Pan-Anglican Congress Committees, who alone are responsible for these Papers.]

S.P.C.K., LONDON: NORTHUMBERLAND AVENUE, W.C.

1908.

PAN-ANGLICAN PAPERS

Being Problems for consideration at the *Pan-Anglican Congress*, 1908.

CHRISTIANITY AND SOCIALISM

BY THE REV. H. ERSKINE HILL, M.A., RECTOR OF ST. GEORGE'S,
MARYHILL, GLASGOW

THE strength of Socialism lies in the grandeur of its ideal. In the midst of a selfish world it is much to be able to conceive the picture of a Society organized on the basis not of Self but of Service, to see the corporate body assuming responsibilities for the diligence of its strong men, the culture and development of its children and the support and protection of its aged and infirm. It is a noble thing for Society itself to aim at

Joy in widest commonalty spread.

and to proclaim that economic conditions which are the result of working in the past on false principles must be made to adapt themselves to a full recognition of human rights.

This ideal is sometimes called the Kingdom of Heaven, and sometimes Utopia, according to the strength or weakness of the faith of the speaker. That it is beautiful all will admit; that it is practicable the Socialist most earnestly believes.

On the other hand, it should not need more than merely "natural" goodness to condemn as intolerable the results of our present social system. Unlimited competition in which the weak are crushed and trampled upon by the strong inevitably brings in its train all the horrors of the sweating system, in which the souls of employers and the bodies and lives of the employed are offered together in one red holocaust upon the altars of mammon, and the sickened earth breaks out into boils like Chicago.

To buy in the cheapest and sell in the dearest market is the one approved maxim of competitive commerce, but the market can be made cheap by inhuman cruelty and dear by falsehood and fraud.

Under competition individual self-interest is cynically avowed to be the sole possible motive in commerce and self-aggrandisement at the expense of others the avowed aim. And the result is the survival, not of the fittest, but—of the smartest, the most cunning, the most brutally strong, in a word, just those who are most unfit for decent society.

Now it is the contrast between the vision of things as they ought to be and the sight of things as they are which generates in the finer type of minds reforming and prophetic fire, and inspires them with an enthusiasm which is essentially religious.

The Church could make no more disastrous mistake than to ignore this fact. Whatever we may think of the politics, the methods, and the manners of the spokesmen of Socialism, let us never forget that we are dealing with what in its higher aspects is a *religion* whose ideal is strangely similar to that which appealed to primitive Christianity.

It is this which gives the movement all its real power and promise,

but we cannot fail to see that it is not this which gives to it the majority of its votes and its place in politics.

It shares a weakness and a danger with its most bitter opponents, viz. the help of those whose motive is acquisitiveness. There is no essential difference between the vice of those who tenaciously grasp what they have and that of those who greedily grasp at what they have not. To both brothers in the Bible story—to him who possessed not, as well as to him who had—the same warning was given, “Take heed and beware of Covetousness.” The eager desire for material wealth may make the wage earner just as keen to support anything which looks like an attack on the “bloated capitalist” as it makes the “bloated capitalist” eager to increase and multiply his millions. It is the tragedy of great movements to be largely discredited by their camp followers. Many a brave and strong leader is joined in his Cave of Adullam by “Every one that is in distress, and every one that is in debt and every one that is bitter of soul.” Silversmiths are the worst possible apologists of the religion of Diana of the Ephesians.

So the movement comes before us like a warrior with many joints in his harness, yet with the sword of God in his hand and with the fire of God in his eye. What is the attitude of the Church towards it to be?

The Church, alas! is largely composed of, and guided by good people who have been comfortably brought up under the old competitive conditions, and who, with their feet on the fender, feel that it is an act of faith to repeat as an excuse for doing nothing the words: “God’s in His Heaven, All’s right with the world.”

There is a mental *vis inertiae* to be overcome. The machinery of the Church is largely carried on by the doles of those whose interest it is to maintain the existing system. She is only half awake, only partially convinced, and certainly not free.

It is little to say that as Christians we cannot in loyalty to our Master fail to accept as our ideal a society organized on the basis of love and service or refuse to condemn its ghastly alternative of a society based on selfish competition. But what then? We accept the ideal. It is delightful to think of Humanity as an ordered and beautiful City—a true Zion—in which the aged shall be duly cared for—“Every man leaning on his staff for very age,”—and in which the young shall have a truly beautiful and happy childhood, “boys and girls playing in the streets thereof”: but are we any nearer to “building Jerusalem in England’s green and pleasant land”. The dark Satanic power whispers the one word “Utopia”, and the vision fades, and we are tempted to store away the ideal in some place “beyond the clouds and beyond the tomb”.

Of what avail is it, in sheer impotence and kindness of heart, to tell those who are crushed beneath the dead weight of a selfish system that all will be made right hereafter? That the Socialistic City of which Zechariah dreamed can only be built “far on those celestial mountains”? That Zion lies “beyond the clouds and beyond the tomb”, and we must resign ourselves to accept Chicago here and now? The mockery of such teaching has entered into the toiler’s soul.

"The dream of the Socialist is impracticable: the evils which follow on Competition are incurable." So we are told, and in this world of illusion it seems true. And then we think of the two great figures which dominate the Book of the Revelation of St. John, the Wild Beast and they that worship him and receive his mark, and the Lamb and those in whose foreheads His name is written.

The Wild Beast is the very embodiment of the spirit of ruthless self-aggrandizement, grasping, tearing, consuming, spreading his tyrannical dominion over the lives and conduct of men, controlling commerce and making it impossible for any man who has not received his mark to buy or sell.

Rebellion against that apparently invincible dominion is pictured as the very condition of salvation.

And then magnificently opposed to that evil power stands the Lamb as it had been slain, the very picture of service and life freely given and seeming weakness lifted up into the strength and light of the Eternal.

Which Kingdom is to establish its dominion over the lives and the commerce of men here and now? That is the question we have to face. We are not asked in our day to achieve the ideal, but to welcome it, and cherish it, and work towards its accomplishment. We see the City of God as an ideal, and believe that it is even now coming down out of Heaven from God and that it is only through the unwearied efforts of men that it can realize itself here on earth. Yet its way must be prepared. We can only build up a true Socialist state by purifying from selfishness the individuals of which that state is composed, beginning, of course, with ourselves. A Socialist community composed of self-seeking individuals is an unthinkable absurdity. The state will inevitably take the form which best expresses the character of the people. A nation can only profitably legislate in the direction of Socialism in proportion as the character of its people is growing more unselfish, that is, more Christian. Those who are captured by the grandeur of the ideal are only the minority, and we must recognize the prosaic fact that in no part of our Anglo-Saxon race is it possible to legislate ahead of the average standpoint of the average man without provoking into disastrous activity and enduing with wrecking power all the blind forces of reaction. With us legislation cannot keep pace with the energy and enterprise of the goodly but limited fellowship of the prophets.

Beyond this average standpoint in social matters it is never safe for us to legislate, but that point is ever shifting forward and it is open to us as Christians to educate people beyond it, to keep steadily pushing it further forward, and also to see that legislation does not fall behind it, nor as far as it has gone become ineffective.

On our present individualistic system "the Kingdom of this world" never could become the "Kingdom of our Lord and of His Christ". On the other hand, when that great assertion can be truly made the dream of the socialist and of the prophet will have been fulfilled. To refuse to work towards what at present seems impracticable is to bow

before the age-long assertion of the Prince of Evil that the supreme authority over this world is "delivered unto" him. God's way of ennobling men is to give them a presently impracticable object to struggle for. They strive and are made strong by the striving, and the strength so gained is theirs for ever; nor is the socialist ideal more impracticable for the State than the command "Ye shall be holy as I am holy" is for the individual.

Further, the Church must emphasize both to those who have and to those who have not the truth that "a man's life consisteth not in the abundance of things that he possesses". This is certainly not realized by the great majority of our people whether rich or poor. The creed which most of us *live* may be illustrated by the remark made recently to a friend of the writer by a "successful" business man: "Man, we're here to mak' siller, and if we dinna mak' siller we're nae guid." The great duty of the Church is to strive to lessen by teaching, and far more by example, the market value of wealth, and to set free for nobler objects the energies and faculties which are now wasted in its pursuit. The depth of degradation to which, as a nation, we have sunk in these matters is manifested by the fact that it is possible in English to ask what a man is "worth", and to be satisfied with an answer in pounds, shillings, and pence. But there is no teaching on this subject like the teaching of example. Surely it is the most spiritually advanced, the most morally developed, who should make the fewest personal claims on the shows and luxuries of life. It is the younger children of the human family who have the most right to the toys. The leaders of men in Church and State might do much if they were strong enough to break through the bad old traditions which surround high office, and set the example of living more simply than others. Luxury and display, if they were abandoned by the great, would go near to being considered as vulgar, as, in fact, they are.

Again, it is open to the Church to join the rising democracy of our day in substituting a frank and generous welcome for the somewhat guarded and nervous toleration hitherto shown to those who have given up all claim to the wealth and comforts of the world to enter into community life.

In ways like these it is possible to bring nearer to realization the great ideal which Christianity and Socialism have in common, and still to keep the Church, as a Church, out of the restless and stormy atmosphere of party strife.

[Published for the Pan-Anglican Congress Committees, who alone are responsible for these Papers.]

SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE.

LONDON: NORTHUMBERLAND AVENUE, W.C.

1908.

PAN-ANGLICAN PAPERS

Being Problems for consideration at the *Pan-Anglican Congress*, 1908.

SOCIALISM, ABSTRACT AND ACTUAL

BY THE REV. CLEMENT F. ROGERS, M.A., LONDON

THE word "Socialism" may be used in two widely divergent senses, either as meaning the doctrines of a certain school of social and political philosophy, or as denoting any of the various movements actually existing in practical form. The one, as an abstract conception, may be either Christian or unchristian; the others, as existing in actual fact among men in Christendom, are certain to have elements that are Christian and features that are of the natural man. As we are asked to consider "What is Christian in Socialism?" I take it that the word is used of the practice and ideas of actual movements.

I

TWO FORMS OF ACTUAL SOCIALISM. A. GENERAL INTEREST IN SOCIAL QUESTIONS

(a) *Concern for the state of the poor*

Thus, "Socialism" is a term used by many to signify the general interest in social questions which has now generally superseded that in the discoveries of Natural Science that marked the last generation. The public conscience is daily becoming more troubled in thinking of the state of masses of the poor. Their material poverty distresses us, and men are more, perhaps, than ever before studying questions of wages, conditions of labour, unemployment, housing, and physical degeneration. Still more does their intellectual and moral poverty exercise us when we consider their language, their literature, their habits of betting and drinking, their ideals in recreation or in work. The crying need of better education is more widely realized. The interest in "Church work", which in the popular mind is exclusively active among the poor, is witness to our growing sense of responsibility to give of our best—of our religion—to those who are without.

(b) *The sense of social duty*

But, with all this growing interest, the Church cannot but deplore the general lack of sense of social obligation. In every cause it is extraordinarily difficult to get serious social workers on whom one can rely. Men of leisure and education seem less and less willing to serve on public bodies, and administration is falling into the hands of a class with lower conceptions of the duties involved in public service. The organization of commerce is doing away with the old relationships of master and man, and the growth of Joint Stock Companies, and the

conditions of town life, predispose men to a life without sense of responsibility to others. The protest against this indifference grows day by day.

(c) *The reform of charity*

And, again, there is an increasing sense that charity as at present administered does little to cure this evil, and frequently fosters it. False conceptions based on patronage, inadequate methods of dole-giving, misleading and sensational appeals to the emotions, the failure to insist on the higher service of charity of the mind, the competition of rival agencies, the overlapping and general disorganization of charitable work, have made men despair of the powers of voluntary efforts of Christian love. Against this despair there is raised a continual protest from a large class who believe that it is still adequate to meet distress, if only it could be organized and directed towards raising the whole state of the people. If Socialism means this growth of interest among men it is all Christian, and the Church is bound to aid in its spread.

B. POPULAR ORGANIZED SOCIALISM

(a) *Collectivism as opposed to charity*

But this social consciousness is vague and ill-defined and its methods tentative and few, while side by side with it is another form, definite, clear, active, and widespread, and ready to absorb it. Popular Socialism aims at definite systems of corporate ownership. It preaches doctrines of collectivism in various forms, ranging from a mild belief in municipal milk to a programme of nationalization of all the means of production. In this it seeks for a remedy for distress, and definitely opposes it to charity both disorganized and, still more, organized.

(b) *Reliance on legislation as opposed to social duty*

Against the conception of personal duty it sets belief in legislation. It aims, by municipal employment, at abolishing the old relationships of employer and employed, with their mutual sense of obligations and duties. For this it seeks to substitute a conception of patriotism and devotion to the commonwealth, and it is marked by a reliance on state schemes for the regeneration of the people.

(c) *Special class legislation*

Consequently, to remedy the state of the poor it falls back on class legislation. "The people", in the language of this form of Socialism, means the class of manual workers and weekly wage earners. Special provision for education is demanded for them, but the majority of its schemes are directed simply to material aid in the form of special legislation for trade organizations, provision of work, rate-aided emigration, housing, feeding of children, or provision for old age. This second form is being propagated on all sides with the enthusiasm of a religion, and by its success has made out its claim to be denoted by the word "Socialism" in common speech.

II

WHAT IS CHRISTIAN IN SOCIALISM? THREE KINDS OF SOCIALISM
RULED OUT*(a) Academic Socialism*

What is Christian then in Socialism? We must first rule out the more exact meanings of the word. To academic Socialism Christianity has no antagonism. As far as the term refers to differences of temperament in men, it is obvious that some are naturally individualists, and are primarily conscious that in the sea of life "we mortal millions live alone"; others by nature feel first that man before realizing his independence is born dependent in a family, from which he passes to the corporate life of the school and city. There is a place for both in the Church, just as she is both Protestant and Catholic.

(b) Political social theory

Nor can the Church take sides in political Socialism. She cannot commit herself to any absolute political theory. Certain things are obviously best done collectively: national government is necessary to prevent individualist anarchy. On the other hand the law of marriage must stand against a Socialism that involves community of wives. But between these extremes there are legitimate differences of position. The Church is not called upon to defend unrestricted competition, nor to advocate methods of protection, and much harm is done when her representatives identify themselves with particular schemes without adequate knowledge. Certain forms, indeed, of co-operation and corporate action are pre-eminently Christian in principle, and it is greatly to be regretted that the Church is so out of touch with the Friendly Society movement, itself a striking example of Christian Socialism.

(c) The defence of property

Still less is the Church called upon to be a mere defender of property. The common criticisms of the Socialist programme may be quite just. Old age pension schemes may be merely a way of making the rich, who pay by far the larger portion of rates and taxes, provide for the declining years of the poor. It may be true that the well-to-do have to educate other people's children, and are now being expected to feed and clothe them as well. It may be true that municipal employment and relief works are enormously extravagant, that public management is quite the most difficult and expensive way of carrying on business that can be found, but a Christian should be ready to be taxed, even unjustly, if it will do any real good to others. Let us have no alliance with any policy of mere selfishness.

No active propaganda needed on these lines

No active propaganda is likely to succeed on these three lines. Academic Socialism appeals only to a few minds, and is no more right or wrong than academic individualism. It would be fatal for the

Church to identify herself with any political party; she can only concern herself with the Christianity of the legislation of either side. And an appeal to self-interest will never rouse the enthusiasm that preaches a gospel. Any policy is good if it be Christian and any policy Christian if it be good. The Church is called to judge of it primarily by its underlying principles, and in a lesser degree by its effects. Ultimately the Christian individualist and the Christian Socialist are indistinguishable, except for the fact that the Socialist by corporate action is more powerful for good, and his special character becomes intensified by reaction from his fellows. But the Christianity which can make Socialism a power for good must be fundamental and not nominal. A mere going to church, or claiming the name of Christ, is useless, and any attempt to "capture the Socialist movement" in order to strengthen the Church is certain to be seen through, and to fail. The mass of men being what they are, the Church must inevitably come into conflict with merely popular movements. She is bound to take a line that will make her profoundly unpopular—and respected.

III

MODERN POPULAR SOCIALISM UNCHRISTIAN

For modern popular Socialism is, surely, profoundly unchristian—unchristian in principle, and therefore disastrous in results. In its philosophy, its economics, its sociology, its psychology, and its policy it, surely, stands for all to which Christianity is diametrically opposed.

(a) Its philosophy

Its philosophy is materialistic. It reflects the materialism of the age, which is practical rather than speculative. It lays continual and prime stress on material things, on comfort, food, wages, houses. Education, culture, things of the mind, hardly figure in its utterances. This conception of life as consisting in the abundance of things a man possesseth, has been further emphasised of late years by quasi-scientific studies which measure poverty by a purely material standard. This philosophy is common in all classes, but it is out of the most materialistic class that Socialism draws its ideals, from the class of manual workers who by occupation and lack of education are predisposed to it and, in England, have nothing to counteract it in the shape of a practised religion.

(b) Its economics and social theory

Its economics and social theory are false also. It is based on a false theory of labour, a term which it uses as equivalent to low-class, or manual, labour. This is assumed to be the sole producer of wealth, while higher forms of labour, those of distribution, management, invention, and teaching, far more potent causes in the production of wealth, are habitually ignored. As a consequence, in its social theory it idealizes the uneducated and degraded, at once blinding us to our grievous fault in that we suffer them to remain as they are, and flattering

them with untrue words which sap their aspirations for higher things, and so prevent their rising. The tone of its teaching is marked with all the defects of the uneducated mind,—suspicion of those who know (e.g. the anti-vaccination movement), credulity (e.g. faith in patent medicines, and in the promises that “under Socialism work would be found for all”), inaccuracy of statement (e.g. that it has been proved that in England thirty per cent. of the poverty is due not to people’s own fault but to economic causes), love of catch-phrases which have no meaning (e.g. “production for use and not for profit”), irresponsibility in the use of words (which are normally used in the platform or Pickwickian sense), narrowness of imagination (e.g. in failure to realize the cost of favourite schemes), incapacity to generalize from more than a few instances (e.g. the common habit of speakers to quote their own experience as typical), and, as a rule, complete unconsciousness that more is wanted. Add to this that in England the tone of the class which gives the note is marked by an absence of the one influence universally available to correct these faults, that of the Church.

(c) *Its psychology*

Its psychology is false in that it assumes that evil is due to circumstances and not to character. On this mechanical and pessimistic assumption as to human nature it bases its policy, in spite of its refutation by all first-hand knowledge of men. Different people in precisely the same position will be entirely different in character, and therefore in surroundings. The mass of distress is due to internal and preventible causes, to improvidence, drink, self-indulgence, laziness, neglect of children by parents and of parents by children, to the habit of living in the present, to dishonesty and bad work, while that due merely to accident and circumstances is comparatively small, and could be all coped with by charity. And this fact of experience corroborates Christ’s promise that if we seek first the Kingdom of God and His Righteousness all the material things that He knows we need will be added to us, and not vice versa.

(d) *Its policy*

So, naturally, the theory of popular Socialism being false, its therapeutics are false also. Its policy is anti-christian. I do not refer to its espousal of the cause of secular education, its desire to disendow the Church, its attitude with regard to the marriage law, even to the perfectly consistent attitude of a section of its press, but to its social legislation. This is marked by an unshaken belief in State action as the cure for all social ills. It believes, apparently, that human nature is changed by donning the robes of office, and that people dishonest in private life will become honest in public employ. This, again, is against all experience, both particular, such as that of the recent Board of Trade inquiries in East and West London, and general, such as that embodied in the common statement that “you cannot make people good by Act of Parliament”. The majority of Socialists

will support practical measures which tend to break up the Family, such as the free public feeding of children, without realizing that such action tends to violate eternal and divine laws, but a not inconsiderable section accept the creed involved in such action and, as in recent discussions on the nature of marriage, deliberately base all morality on the action and will of the State.

IV

THIS SOCIALISM TO BE OPPOSED BECAUSE OF THE HARM IT DOES TO THE POOR

The Socialism based on these principles is naturally disastrous in practical results, and the Church is bound further to oppose it as involving consequent material and, what is worse, grievous moral and spiritual harm to the poor.

(a) Material harm, stereotyping bad conditions of life

In the first place it stereotypes bad conditions of life. This is the inevitable result of all special treatment or legislation intended not as a temporary measure to cure certain evils, but to be permanent. All forms of protection, preferential dealing, special methods for the poor, and dole-giving, merely establish and foster the misery and want they are intended to relieve. This was the experience of the old Poor Law, which acted on the assumption that a large class could not, and could not be expected to, earn sufficient to live. The theory of the old feudalism was the same, and, with much that was beautiful in its sense of the mutual duties of rich and poor, it produced widespread pauperism and suffering. The new Socialism has all the evils of the old feudalism with none of its merits. It makes the poor dependent on the rich (i.e. the taxpayers), but it relieves them even of the sense of obligation by directing it to an abstraction called the State, which they are told, quite falsely, is but another term for themselves. At the same time it relieves the rich of their responsibilities because they are, in theory, the same abstraction, and discharge their duties by deputy. In practice the deputy is a popularly elected board the members of which may, or may not, be able to resist the temptations involved in their office, but which certainly cannot maintain the personal relations even of the old feudalism. It, further, subsidizes unsatisfactory conditions of life, and thereby discourages men's efforts to rise, as effectually as did the old pauperising methods of dole-giving, but it does so on a far larger scale, and on one that has no limits short of municipal or national bankruptcy. On merely material grounds, in the interests of the poor themselves, the Church should use her utmost efforts to oppose this form of Socialism.

(b) Moral harm in discouragement of individual effort

But far more should she do so for the sake of things that matter more. For such socialism cries out for rights instead of insisting on duties. There is, it is true, much talk about public service, but, in

practice, men who travel third class when paying for themselves generally go first when engaged on public work. Public management is not merely quite the most expensive and cumbersome method of administration that exists; it also entails a vast amount of absolute waste of the most valuable kinds of wealth that the country possesses. A poor man will do far more of his own free will for his own children than for those of others; he will keep an apprentice running errands, but will take infinite pains to teach his own boy his trade. The labour of a mother that is gladly given in the home is simply lost when her duties are transferred to a State-hired stranger. If hopes are held out that the State will find work, individual effort promptly ceases. Moreover, this sapping of individual character will tend to destroy all working class "self-managed movements", such as Trade Unions and Friendly Societies, for who will join voluntary associations which involve duties, if their benefits can be claimed from the State as rights? With this will go a vast treasure of political education which interest in these movements gives. It seems to be already checking the continuous and steady advance in the welfare of the artizan and labouring classes that has taken place during the past seventy years, during which individualist theory has been dominant. And the dead loss of all this wealth that would otherwise be produced is nothing by the side of the loss of character, of initiative, and of all that is most beautiful in human life.

(c) *Spiritual harm*

And with material and moral degradation goes spiritual also. Though circumstances do not cause character, they react upon it. If bad conditions of life are fixed, they have great influence, though not, of course, the chief, in binding men's minds down to constant thought on material things. In this way materialistic theory, and the material suffering it induces, act and react on one another, and the one cure for the evil becomes harder and harder to reach.

V

THE DUTY OF THE CHURCH

I hope I am wrong in saying that this form of materialistic Socialism is the dominant form to-day, but I am certain that it exists and that only Christianity can counteract it. We need, therefore, in the Church a complete change of attitude towards "the poor". We want to drop all "special methods for the poor", except such as are avowedly temporary, and established to remove the great differences that exist between class and class. We want to get rid of all methods of dole-giving, to uproot the idea that the Church is a great relief agency, and this in the interest of the poor themselves. Still more do we need to avoid all pandering to those who wish to establish a national system of dole-giving, to resist the idea that the State should be a vast pauperizing agency. In the interests of the poor themselves we want to make claims on them both for Church and State; we want to believe in them, to call out their latent capabilities, to raise them, to establish

their independence, to call upon them to respect themselves. If we, able to see the underlying principles and far-off issues to which they are blind, have to say unpopular things, let us say them. If they say "we have no king but Caesar", and use the civil power to scourge the Church and lead her out beyond the city, it does not matter. This is what always happens to anyone who refuses to conform to the popular role of the Saviour of the People.

The Example of Christ

For Christ saw, as none of us can see, the degradation and misery of the world. He never pretended that it was anything but terrible. He taught the responsibility of riches. But He saw that the world's woes would not be cured by dole-giving, by turning stones to bread, by any material means of dominion that involved bowing down to a false principle. He did not patronize, like the benefactor Gentile Kings who exercised lordship and authority, though He was eternally above all classes. Nor did He degrade Himself by accepting popular views, and identifying Himself with the people who knew not the law, though He emptied Himself and thought His equality with the Highest no prerogative to be held fast. He went down with all His riches—the true riches—to share with those who lacked, not to leave them in their poverty, but to tell them there was a higher within their reach if as individuals they would stretch out to it, to call them to raise themselves by His aid, to lift them up to their duties in that state of life into which may it please God to call them, that state in which there shall be neither Jew nor Greek, bond nor free. And He surely is the example for the Church.

[Published for the Pan-Anglican Congress Committees, who alone are responsible for these Papers.]

SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE.

LONDON : NORTHUMBERLAND AVENUE, W.C.

1908.

PAN-ANGLICAN PAPERS

Being Problems for consideration at the *Pan-Anglican Congress*, 1908.

CHRISTIANITY AND SOCIALISM

WHAT IS NOW PRACTICABLE?

By DOUGLAS EYRE, Esq., OXFORD HOUSE, BETHNAL GREEN, E.

ALL Socialists alike recognize that in human society the liberties and interests of the individual or class are subordinate to those of the community as a whole, and that this subordination can only be effected and the common good secured by direct constructive action on the part of the State.

Such action should, they say, extend to procure the immediate or ultimate ownership by the State itself of at least the means or instruments of production and distribution.

All Socialists have this in common—that they do not believe in individual property in these means or instruments, however widely diffused it may be. They do not, for instance, advocate peasant proprietorship as regards the land, or the ownership of the mines by the miners. No Socialist would in this sense universalize property or adopt any sectional policy. If he did he would be an Individualist and not a Socialist at all. State ownership and State control are the watch-words of Socialism. The difference between the various forms of Socialism is more than one of degree :—

1. There is the Communist, who would press the principles of Socialism to an extreme by securing a common ownership of all property and its common management in the equal interests of all, so that no one could say that any property was his own. The voluntary action of a select number of people as to each other's goods in the early days of Christianity is quoted as a precedent for coercive action on the part of the State on a colossal scale.

2. There is the Socialist of the Karl Marx type, whose immediate goal is collectivism, who condemns all private property in the means of production and distribution, but at the same time allows private property in the articles of consumption. While requiring the substitution of collective for private property in all instruments of production, and the corporate organization and management of every business, the collectivist would allow the distribution of the collective output according to the value and amount of the work done by each individual; that is, equitable but not equal distribution.

3. There is the Socialist who does not regard all private property in the means of production and distribution as unjust, seeing that labour is not the sole factor in the work of production and distribution, but considers that it is expedient and to the interests of the community that the progress of society should be distinctly and decisively towards collectivism, that such progress should be by evolutionary stages, and that it is the function and to the interest of the State to stimulate this progress and to expedite the retreat of privilege and of inequality of condition by active intervention.

He would secure to all an equal opportunity for rising in the social sphere, and this primarily and immediately by a bolder and more

sweeping and systematic use of the process of State regulation than any government in this country has as yet resorted to.

This process, he sees, leads on to State ownership and control of at least the prime materials of production.

It is submitted that it is in this third form that what is now practicable in English Socialism is embodied.

It is the prime function of English Socialism at the dawn of the twentieth century to get the best possible out of its component elements. To do this it must seek to develop for all members of society that equality of opportunity which certainly is not secured merely by political enfranchisement or by the application of the doctrines of Individualists. Merely to free the individual from the fetters imposed by class privilege and class legislation is not enough, nor is it enough to multiply individual ownerships.

It is clear that neither in America nor elsewhere does political enfranchisement by itself sufficiently control the capitalist classes, and the rings, trusts, syndicates, and similar associations for the control of production and the artificial upkeep of prices in the interests of individuals and classes. (See Flint's *Socialism*, pp. 215, 216.)

It is also clear that vast wealth, the subject of so much vulgar worship, is too often acquired by shamefully selfish means and employed for shamefully selfish purposes; that some ways of accumulating it have nothing to do with individual merit or service, but depend merely on the growth of society; that there are too many luxurious, vicious, and idle lives lived in our midst; that there is much dishonesty in trade, and that there are some very vicious ways of trading, notably those connected with the pushing of the sale of spirituous liquors, and betting, and gambling, and fraudulent company promoting, which are dead against the interests of the community.

It is seen that wages have not increased relatively to capital (Flint, p. 171); that the prevailing conditions of existence have no rational sanction for the masses of the population who submit to them (Kidd, *Social Evolution*, p. 76); that there is "a colossal ant-heap of stunted life pent up in crowded ways"; and that "the flood of poverty has altogether overflowed the embankments which the poor-law has provided to contain it" (J. R. Macdonald, *Socialism and Society*, 1907, p. 2); that the poor-law has not struck bottom by decreeing the bare necessities of existence, that it is too severe on old age, too lenient to vagrants, the work-shy, and the dissolute, and is for the most part inefficiently administered; that the physical and moral condition and surroundings of multitudes of human beings, including helpless infants and children of tender years, in most of our large towns, is a scandal and disgrace to society; that the rural population is in a state of decay, and has not emerged, as it ought to have done by now, from a status of dependency to a condition of equality.

It is seen that physical strength and an honest will are not enough to secure continuity of employment, and that in consequence humanity in large numbers, though freely educated in the primary schools and politically enfranchised, is hard driven and condemned to accept

a lower than a living wage, is preyed on by sweaters and misled by agitators.

Significant, indeed, is the fact that for the community every rural area depopulated, every urban area overcrowded, every centre of population without its open spaces and recreative institutions, every insanitary dwelling, every infant ill-nurtured, every school child underfed, every brilliant scholar in our primary schools denied the opportunity of mounting the educational ladder, every lad and girl condemned, through pressure of home life or otherwise, to lives of unskilled employment which leave them stranded when manhood or womanhood is reached, every reservoir of casual labour, every parasitic trade, not only points clearly to a breach of Divine Law, but at the same time represents so much economic loss to the State.

The Socialist declares that it is at once the right and duty of the State to step in and force a minimum standard of fraternity, and at the same time prevent the occurrence of all this loss. This involves a big constructive programme, a large measure of active State intervention and control. At the same time he must be practical. Largeness of heart must not be accompanied by softness of head.

To be practical he must conform to the laws of God.

i. He will believe in and apply the law of Evolution. "The whole creation moves", but it is a slow though at the same time a majestic and ceaseless progress; and one not consisting of a series of cataclysms or of leaps and bounds. "First the grain, and then the ear, and then the full corn in the ear." England is the best country in which to study the developments of the modern spirit, says Dr. Kidd (*Social Evolution*, chap. viii, *Modern Socialism*), "not only for the reason which influenced Marx, namely, that it is the land in which modern capitalism and industrialism obtained their earliest and fullest expression; but also because, in this country, the process of social development has been less obscured by local causes and less interrupted by disturbing events. It has on the whole proceeded by regular orderly and successive stages in the past, and it shows no signs of weakening or cessation in the present."

Our progress has been effected not by a series of revolutions, but by what Macaulay has termed a series of peaceful and lawful reforms: one age in English history has been most distinctly the honest successor of another age.

(a) Political enfranchisement has been gradual. Both parties in the State have had to contribute to it, even though the motive of one may have been to "dish" the other.

(b) Trade and commerce are only gradually becoming emancipated from the control of the privileged classes, but the emancipation is sure on that account.

(c) The policy of *laissez-faire* is only gradually, but none the less inevitably, becoming transmuted into the policy of active State regulation and control.

The law of Evolution is also seen to be at work when we trace in detail the progress of the Labour or Factory movement. The methods

of Trade Unions, which are based on the theory that the liberty sacrificed is less important than the liberty gained (Hobhouse, *Democracy and Reaction*, p. 218), commence with mutual insurance, which is succeeded by collective bargaining, and ultimately by legal enactment in the interests of the community and not merely of the trade. Industrial diplomacy succeeds industrial war as the recognized means of settling disputes and of bringing public opinion to the side of the Labour cause. The law of trade conspiracy has gone onward gradually to its doom. Factory legislation gathers volume in progressive stages (see in particular on these points Sidney Webb's *History of Trade Unionism* and his *Industrial Democracy*).

There is lastly, as Kidd points out, a gradual development of altruism, a process of self-action consisting in a softening of character, a gradual loss of faith in their own cause which is contributing to undermine the position of the power-holding classes (*Social Evolution*).

Great, indeed, is the gulf that is fixed between evolutionary and revolutionary Socialism. Let the Socialist take care not to draw a pen through the past, nor to fail to derive light from the minds of the great thinkers of bygone days.

2. The practical Socialist will believe in and apply the law of comprehension, which he also finds laid down by the Highest Authority. The sower sows broadcast. He covers the whole ground. He does not select the most favoured spots. The fisherman gathers in of every kind. Brotherhood under the Divine Law is universal. The ideal servant is not the servant of a majority, but of all.

The ideal trader regards not only wife and family, but employé and customer also.

Socialism, shining with the reflected light of Christianity, is based on an ardent belief in fraternity and a sincere desire for the welfare of the whole community. This belief and this desire should lead to comprehensiveness of vision and action.

The Utilitarian saw: (a) that the country must no longer be governed mainly in the interests of the classes; (b) that the function of Government is not confined to acts of prohibition. But Priestley's formula, "the greatest happiness of the greatest number," which became Bentham's war-cry and constituted the basis of nineteenth-century reform, is defective.

Socialism, the successor of Utilitarianism, must see in what the defect consists. (1) "Happiness" is an ambiguous phrase. It may not carry us beyond mere materialism. (2) With "the greatest number" we are still confined within the realm of class.

True Socialism will surely see that the masses comprehend the classes, and that all are members one of another. It will surely realize the complex nature of man and not insult him by regarding him as merely the creature of material pleasure and material pain.

Mr. Blatchford has done well, in his advocacy of a comprehensive policy and programme, to commend to his readers the catholic language of what he describes as the beautiful Litany of the Church of England (*Britain for the British*, 1906, pp. 1, 2).

And again, if the function of Government is to provide for the greatest good of the whole community, it follows that Parliament must become "truly representative of the nation as an organized whole, of the steady, persistent, and general pervading reason of the Commonwealth". The time will also come for universal suffrage, if it has not already arrived (Flint, *Socialism*, pp. 331, 332). Municipal government also requires to be reformed so as to become thoroughly representative (see Report of Select Committee of House of Lords on Proportional Representation, 1907).

The Upper House, too, sorely needs mending. The time can hardly be far off when no man will be allowed to fill the office of legislator merely "because he is the son of his father". It needs to be really aristocratic and representative throughout and really powerful (Flint, *Socialism*, p. 312). The Socialist is not alone in demanding Parliamentary reform, but he has trumpeted his dissatisfaction as no others have. This criticism of the Parliamentary system is admitted by Professor Flint to be searching, unsparing, not lacking in truth.

If Socialism becomes the great constructive force in politics, let it see that all the interests are represented in Parliament and in municipal government. Let it be careful to take "an organic view of society". Let it see that improvement in the economic State is a stepping-stone to improvement in the intellectual, moral, and religious State.

The need for the full development of the personality of every individual member of the community comprehends the character, and is not confined to the material condition. The Socialist State will seek to rear not only sharp wits but sound characters. It is its business and it is quite practicable for it, in spite of the difficulties in the shape of sectarian rivalry and controversy which beset its path, to provide directly for the religious as well as the secular education of its people, realizing that it is "a spiritual body to which we belong, traversed from head to foot by spiritual forces, demanding from every member of it obedience to moral laws, giving occasion at every step of its life for obedience to those spiritual principles which are the salvation of the world" (Richmond, *Christian Economics*, p. 51).

3. The practical Socialist will believe in and apply the law of equilibrium. The life and teaching of Christ plainly declare this to be a law of God. The true Socialist will be well balanced.

He will ponder over the calm dignity and perfect control over passion displayed by Christ in His trials and temptations, and realize His vast superiority in these respects to other historical personages entitled to take high place among the heroes of history: silence when it was golden, speech when it was needed.

He will see in Christ the perfect exponent of Aristotle's precept: *μηδὲν ἄγαν*—the rule of the mean between extremes—which would have us look at every vice and every act of wrongdoing as an overbalancing, and at every virtue or state of soundness, in so far as humanity is capable of attaining to it, as a "rhythmical medium between excess and defect".

"Let your yea be yea and your nay, nay, for whatsoever is in excess

of this cometh of evil." "Render to Caesar what is Caesar's, and to God what is God's." "Be not over-anxious or distracted about your material life."

The inequality of gifts and opportunities is balanced by the inequality of responsibility (parable of the talents).

Humanity finds this law of the even balance a hard one to keep, and so it is small wonder that we find in Socialism much on the side of excess and much on the side of defect. The practical Socialist steadfastly confronts the waves of the world's disorders with an even keel.

He may well insist on the need of redressing the balance by pointing to "the alternating periods of over-work and unemployment", to "excess of riches on the one side and abject poverty on the other", to the superabundance of opportunity in the hands of the few, and the absence of it in the case of the many.

"A State which does not hold the balance equal between conflicting interests and parties, which allows any one class of its citizens to oppress or plunder any other class, which does not prevent individuals from doing wrong and injury to the community, is a State which fails to justify its own existence." (*Flint*, p. 119.)

It is this failure which breeds anarchism. At the same time the true Socialist will realize that—

(a) "Too swift arrives as tardy as too slow."

(b) The equal right to rule is balanced by the co-relative duty to obey. "Self-devotion rather than self-assertion is the spring of all enduring and beneficent influence."

(c) The law of exchange consists in "the even equipoise of the scales of justice". Expropriation must be the subject of fair compensation.

(d) Faith must be regulated by reason, hope must be tempered by experience, enthusiasm must be disciplined. Passions and aspirations must be held in check by "externalities that can be felt and fingered". There is a mean between "a sceptical pessimism" and "a shallow and illusory optimism" (*Flint*, p. 261).

(e) The rights of capital, and inventive and organizing ability, have to be weighed with those of manual labour. Their proper place must be assigned to all the factors of production, and none must be ignored or undervalued.

(f) While "the world is more and more", the "individual" must not "wither". His interests and responsibilities must be wholly subordinate to, but not therefore wholly absorbed in, those of the community. Each cell forming part of the body politic has an individuality of its own, which must be maintained.

Mill saw that the problem of the future was how to unite individual liberty with common ownership in the raw material of production and an equitable participation of all in the benefits of combined labour.

"The most vigorous social systems are those in which are combined the most effective subordination of the individual to the social organism with the highest development of his own personality" (*Kidd, Social Evolution*).

In conclusion, it may be well to note the stage which has been reached in England as the year 1907 speeds onward to its close. The position is midway between Liberalism and Collectivism. People in large numbers are looking shyly and askance at modern tendencies which are inevitable.

1. There are in increasing numbers Acts of Parliament passed which embody Socialistic principles—yet the Legislature seems half afraid of each principle as it adopts it. (a) The Factory Laws, the product of “a movement which has given prestige and authority to the ideas of collectivism”, culminated in the Labour Code of 1901—“the most notable achievement of English Socialism” (Dicey, *L. & P. O.*, p. 237). But that Act was avowedly incomplete. The Legislature must needs be constantly engaged in adding to its provisions. Laundries, for instance, have only this year been embodied in the Code.

Factory legislation is, and always has been, of a piecemeal character, more so than might have been expected.

(b) The Workmen's Compensation Acts are based on a principle of first-rate social importance. The Legislature has decreed, and in so doing has registered another “popular conception of the just conditions of life”, that for compensation purposes, at any rate, employer and employed shall be regarded as engaged in a joint enterprise. The employed is a co-operator in the business, and no longer in a worse position than an outsider as regards injuries sustained in the course of his work. The right to compensation is a trade expense to be reckoned as part of the cost of production. The first Act left out whole regiments of the industrial army, and was, moreover, so fenced round with restrictions and limitations as not only to be a veritable puzzle-box for our courts of law, but also to involve the expenditure of parliamentary time on amending and extending enactments themselves devoid of finality.

(c) The Education (Administrative Provisions) Act, 1907, provides for Vacation schools and the medical inspection of school children, and empowers local authorities to make other arrangements as regards the promotion of the health of their children on the principle that the child is the child of the State as well as of the individual parents, and an inefficient child is a loss to the community. Effect has been given to this principle by intermittent doses of legislation, ranging over a considerable period, and all preceded by much effort and agitation on the part of individuals. A vast deal remains to be done. There is urgent need for further applications of the principle at the hands of the Legislature to improve the conditions of child life, and in particular to regulate the employment of children—lads and girls—and to secure their training on lines of skilled employment. Nothing but legislation on Socialistic principles can effect what is requisite. The material interests of the community and the physical and moral welfare of the children alike demand it.

2. The country, too, is marking time, watchful of the Socialistic experiments which are in progress in the self-governing colonies and on the Continent.

Those that she deems sound and beneficial she will in the long run adopt. She will watch other States "angling in the Lake of Darkness"; she will end by following in the train of their success.

Progress, too, will be facilitated by the breaking down of national barriers with the advance of the conception of fraternity and its application to international and inter-colonial relationships and with improved means of intercommunication. More and more will nations and commonwealths join hands with a view to the adoption of a common standard of social reform; witness the Employment of Women Act, 1907, which is based on a convention with foreign Powers for regulating women's work in all the countries of western and central Europe and a part of Norway.

3. The country is determined to continue to take advantage of individual initiative, yet she is ready to make collective use of it in the end. The individual sows, the State reaps. For instance, the rule is for statutory undertakings authorizing the supply of electricity, the laying of trams, etc., in a city to contain provisions enabling the State or municipality to acquire them for the community after the lapse of a specific period.

It happens—and this has a deal to do with the greatness of England—that the country has ever been rich in individual adventurers in all fields of human endeavour. Individuals dare and endure for material reward and otherwise, and succeed in pointing to the solution of a great problem. It is the way out, but voluntary effort cannot cover the ground. It is then that the State can, and does eventually, step in and take over the undertaking. This is as it should be; but the State chariot-wheels are apt to linger; they roll along too slowly, even when they are set in motion; and then the bull-dog tenacity of the individual is apt, when the State arrives on the scene, to resent the arrival and to cling to the object of intervention. It has been thus with elementary education. It will be thus with advanced education.

There is a two-fold drag.

We might do well to be more expeditious. "The flesh grows weary of the long delays", says the *Commonwealth* of September, 1907.

There would be less delay if modern tendencies were more fully grasped by the generality; if the constituencies were to return more members to Parliament with first-hand knowledge of the lives of the poor and the problems of modern industry; if there emerged from those members some great parliamentary leader.

We err from excess of caution. There are signs of timidity. If we linger too long it may be too late. And so the conclusion must be:—

Be bolde. Be bolde. And everywhere be bolde.
Be not too bolde, Yet better the excess
Than the defect. Better the more than less.

[Published for the Pan-Anglican Congress Committees, who alone are responsible for these Papers.]

S.P.C.K., LONDON: NORTHUMBERLAND AVENUE, W.C.

1908.

PAN-ANGLICAN PAPERS

Being Problems for consideration at the *Pan-Anglican Congress*, 1908.

THE DUTY OF THE CLERGY TOWARDS SOCIAL REFORM

BY THE REV. J. G. SIMPSON, M.A., PRINCIPAL OF THE
LEEDS CLERGY SCHOOL

At the Leeds meeting of the Ripon Diocesan Conference last October a leading layman, Sir Francis Powell, took advantage of a motion concerning the increase of the northern episcopate, to inveigh against the interference of our younger bishops in questions economic. In so doing he doubtless expressed the mind of many devout Churchmen among the classes who have sat uneasily under the teaching of the Christian Social Union and who abhor the Church Socialist League. Let an unfortunate parson but be reported in the local press as having uttered sentiments vaguely sympathetic towards the cause of Labour, and at once he receives through the post a pamphlet bound in lurid red in which are set forth the dangerous fallacies of the Socialistic heresy. In the view of these excellent people the clergy are to preach about conscience but to avoid companies, to inculcate duty but shun dividends, to recommend righteousness but eschew politics.

But the man of God is at once confronted with the startling fact that it was precisely in adopting the course here recommended that the false prophet of the Bible found himself differentiated from the true. The clergy do not preach much from the Old Testament. Surely it is Satan himself who has turned the higher criticism into a bogey wherewith to frighten the clergy from proclaiming the Father's message as it is writ large on the face of Hebrew prophecy. Ahab hates Micaiah because "he doth not prophesy good concerning me but evil", in other words, because in the name of God he is opposed to his foreign policy. Isaiah was always meddling with politics. Some of his most glorious pictures of the Messianic Kingdom of Righteousness were painted from what we can only call the opposition benches. Jeremiah was called a Pro-Chaldaean. There was a land question in Israel, and none were more faithful in exposing its tyrannies than the official preachers of righteousness. Isaiah proclaims his woe against those that add field to field till there be no room, whose ambition it is to dwell alone in the land. Micah's eye is on the same agrarian trouble.

When men have built their palaces on the ruin of many peoples Habakkuk declares that the stone shall cry out of the wall, the beam out of the chamber shall answer it. The drink question is also clamant. You meet it in Isaiah : " Woe unto them that are mighty to drink wine "—in Amos : " Woe to them that drink wine in bowls "—in Habakkuk : " Woe unto him that giveth his neighbour drink." The market is corrupt : they " buy the poor for silver and the needy for a pair of shoes " ; they " pant after the dust of the earth on the head of the poor " Bribery is rampant, and meets the severe judgement of Amos. Society is heedless and luxurious, resting on an unjust distribution of wealth, and has no grief for the afflictions of God's people. And the most terrible feature in the whole indictment is the pious platitudes in the mouth of the professional representatives of religion, when they talk glibly about God's presence and protection, the tags of piety that are expected in the sermons of those who supply in a highly respectable and orthodox fashion the popular demand for religion, the priests who " teach for hire " and the prophets who " divine for money ".

Then, secondly, the clergy are brought into close and intimate contact with phases of the national life to which those who would upbraid them for Socialism are comparative strangers. They see on the one side the superfluities of the rich, and on the other the narrow lives of the poor. The whole map of modern society is unrolled before them as before few others. They at least may know by personal contact what the inequality of opportunity really means, and the contrast that, even where the poor are contented with their situation, keeps the two ends of society poles asunder. Is it wonderful that the doubt should occur whether after all the Lord God made " the rich man in his castle, the poor man at his gate ", whether the various estates of men are as much of divine ordering as is conventionally supposed ; whether it may not be for us to create " that state of life unto which it shall please God to call " many who but for our efforts may miss their vocation ?

Then we have the undoubted historical fact that a renewal in evangelical religion has produced political and social emancipations. There is, for example, a close connexion between John Wesley and William Wilberforce. Butler based all morality upon the fact that human nature is rightly interpreted in that charter of Christian Socialism, St. Paul's oft-repeated doctrine, " We are members one of another." Wesley set fire to this intellectual belief, kindling it into reality and action, when, taking the world for his parish, he preached to all who would listen, " the old, old story of Jesus and His love," and woke once again in slumbering consciences an enthusiastic love of " the

brother *for whom Christ died*". Before that great movement it was taken almost for granted that slavery was an institution of society which operated for the good of all concerned. The bishops who steadily voted against emancipation in the House of Lords were doubtless for their day as good Christians as their latest successors. They agreed with Birdofredum Sawin that

'it aint no gret of a disaster
To be benev'lently druv back to a contented master,
Ware you had Christian priv'ledges you don't seem quite aware on,
Or you'd ha' never run away from 'bein' well took care on.'

But to-day it seems to us a simple matter of course that the slave trade is an immoral traffic. It is an axiom that every man has a right to be free.

The same is true of the factory legislation, which is a direct infringement of commercial freedom. Lord Shaftesbury bore the brunt of class opposition because he felt it to be his duty as a Christian to assert the moral claim of humanity in the conduct of industry. It was the imperious demand of the Master whom he served to which he was compelled to give heed.

What we have most to beware of to-day is lest we should proclaim ourselves the children of those who slew the prophets by building their sepulchres. If Christian ministers stood aside from taking any part in or expressing any views concerning the enterprises with which the names of Wilberforce and Ashley are to their undying honour connected, they failed in their duty as spiritual guides. Writing here in Leeds, I cannot forget that one great Vicar, Dr. Hook—one of that all too small but illustrious band of preachers who never feared the face of man, publicly and enthusiastically supported the Ten Hours Bill in 1849, though his supporters among the business men of the town were almost solid in their opposition. It was no use for us to say that, as English lovers of freedom, we would have followed Wilberforce, we would have supported Shaftesbury. If this sort of cap-tossing declaration be accompanied by a resolute reticence on every economic question affecting the life of our fellow countrymen to-day, we are building prophets' tombs. For to denounce nigger-drivers in this twentieth century is about as useful as to wither those who make broad their phylacteries. The devil is Protean in his methods, but to hear the platitudes of many preachers, laying down what they would call general moral principles, one would think that they, unlike St. Paul, were entirely "ignorant of his devices".

Where, if not in the intricate complexity of our industrial and commercial activities, which make up more than half the life of nine-tenths of our populations, may we expect to find this sinister presence? What is this cry of "Hands off"

addressed to the preacher of righteousness when he attempts to arouse the consciences of men who imagine that they can evade their responsibilities by distributing their investments, but a suggestion of the Evil One. It matters nothing that the demand is made by pious men and earnest Christians. St. Peter was both, and an Apostle to boot, yet his remonstrance was so characterized by the divine Master Himself. Has the Christian Church no word to say to companies? Dare we treat their responsibility as small because their liability is limited? Take a few instances.

What should we say of a private employer, if he deliberately paid his women-workers on a scale which threw them on the streets for an all but necessary supplement to their miserable earnings, even if these were not deliberately calculated on the understanding that they would be eked out by the wages of sin? One of Mr. Bernard Shaw's *Unpleasant Plays* is an indictment of society for remunerating women's work at a rate so low that the wreckage of feminine honour which attends the progress of civilization is in part a terrible consequence of economic injustice towards the more helpless and less organized class of workers. It is no answer to such an accusation to speak contemptuously of the author who makes it. It is no answer to say that these poor sinners must be bad, for the good would rather starve. We have not to deal with paragons of virtue, but with average human nature, as the poacher's widow with brutal frankness reminds the Squire in *Alton Locke*. And can it be doubted that the owners of textile works, clothing factories, dressmaking establishments, and other branches of industry too numerous to mention, have in this matter a serious responsibility to face?

Or railways. It is, perhaps, here, in consequence of the widespread "interests" represented by the body of shareholders that the difficulties of the situation are most obvious. Avoiding burning questions, let us take the instance of Sunday rest. Year by year a larger number of Sunday excursions are advertised. In some parts of the country the Sunday passenger traffic is incessant. More than this, you cannot spend the day in sight of a great main line without witnessing an almost continuous procession of goods trains, involving an amount of labour which it is difficult to imagine is all necessary or urgent. Year by year a small band of shareholders, to their honour be it said, lift up their voice to the manifest annoyance of the directorate, in favour of a great reduction in Sunday work. Then uprises the Chairman, not improbably a Churchman whose own pew, it may be, is not regularly empty, and reminds the conscientious holder of a few paltry shares that railway com-

panies are not benevolent institutions, that they are the servants of the public, and all the rest of it. But who is asking them to be philanthropic? All that is demanded is that the same sort of obligations shall be recognized as would obtain in the case of a master smith towards his apprentices, of a housewife towards her maids. A labourer is worthy of his hire, no matter who employs him. A man is entitled to his rest, whether he work in a farmyard or an engine-shed.

The notice of confirmation, which at any rate used to be read in churches, calling upon masters and mistresses, no less than upon parents and sponsors, to put young people in mind of their religious obligations, witnesses to solemn responsibilities which were universally recognized in a simpler state of society. If the Church is not to be allowed to lift up its voice to warn society that the commonest moral obligations remain in an age of more intricate arrangements and greater complexity, then its function as the salt of the earth is fast disappearing; its message is for patriarchs not for plutocrats; its transitory opportunity is fitly symbolized by the little village church, which almost seems to apologize for its presence among the towering factories and lofty mill-chimneys of many modern centres of industry.

What is imperatively needed is to develop what we may call the machinery of conscience, so that it may deal readily and effectively with the complex material on which it has to work. Maxims suitable to a nation of farmers are primitive tools with which to operate where capital is massed and industry highly organized. But it is giving up the contest altogether to allow that Wall Street or the West Riding are to manage the life and happiness of multitudes on principles that are purely "economic". "In the last days men shall be lovers of self, lovers of money." And nothing suits the book of the clever "Anti-socialist" better than the application of an abstract political economy to the concrete realities of life, which enables directors to "do their duty to the shareholders" and investors to draw their dividends as thoughtlessly as they would draw a match-box from a penny-in-the-slot machine.

That conscience is not yet half enough awake is witnessed by such pictures as President Roosevelt vigorously scouring the Columbian eagle, which will need a deal of rubbing before he finishes; by the conditions of life in the most productive centres of British industry, of which the parish priest knows infinitely more than the managing directors of the big company, the smoke of whose forges makes a parched and barren wilderness of what by courtesy is called the Vicarage Garden. The problem before us is the transference of moral relations from the well-recognized

sphere of the family and those simpler forms of social intercourse which partake of the nature of family life to groups which, arising out of the material needs upon the supply of which mankind depends for its persistence and progress, inevitably become by the fact of association new units of society, new centres of moral obligation. And the solution of this problem is one that necessarily claims the attention of all classes of the community. For however true it be to say that companies on the one hand, and labour combinations on the other, represent society organizing itself for the production of wealth and its just distribution among the producers, there are within the social organism other groups which witness by their existence to the fact that human society has wider ends than those which can properly be called economic, and that the wealth-producing function must be controlled and conditioned by the purposes of a larger life. And the Church claims to set before men a vision of this larger life when it proclaims that "man's chief end is to glorify God and to enjoy Him for ever". For dividends who will dare to destroy the brother *for whom Christ died*? No one has the right, for purposes of trade, so to abstract one aspect of the labourer from the general end for which he became a living soul, as in practice, if not in theory, to treat him as an animated tool.

There are two principles for which the Church is bound to contend earnestly when its message is "applied" to the organization of capital. The first is Life as the ultimate standard of all values, that Life, which consists not in the abundance of possessions, and which is more than meat. If Life be the measure of Wealth, then those who direct the production of wealth cannot ignore or destroy the living agent by whom it is produced. Society had better do without any commodity than take an unwilling toll of human happiness or human life. "Woe unto him that buildeth a city with blood." Serfdom, disguise it though you may by the most solicitous care for physical welfare or material comfort, is an offence against personal life. Not a formal freedom of contract, but a genuine liberty of action must be allowed to every man. There is no stage in manufacture or in distribution at which persons and personal relations are not paramount considerations.

The other principle is Service. Conscience requires that the investment of capital no less than the exertion of personal faculties of mind or hand is primarily an act of service. In proportion as true ideals of citizenship are reached, and our aim must be increasingly to organize society in principles which involve the noblest conception of human nature, faculties whether of mind, body, or estate are primarily powers of acting for the common weal, not of procuring private advantage.

If, therefore, a dividend of two per cent. instead of four means the difference between life and existence to the labourers in any commercial enterprise, if it means the employment of adult male workers at a wage calculated on the basis of the family instead of half-developed children and girls or even married women, then a public opinion which submits to the rule of educated conscience will not demand that the profits of the business should be doubled. Commercialism is based on the principle of exchange, a crude and often cruel substitute for mutual aid arising out of an atomic view of society in which each individual represents a separate interest. Christian morality rests on the Pauline axiom that in the Body of Christ crucified we are members one of another. Its application to industrialism must therefore give rise to an evolution which shall be directed towards drawing forth the utmost capacity of every part for the supreme good of the whole. This is the principle of brotherhood and service.

What is the use of a Christian Church proclaiming that "a man's life consisteth not in the abundance of things which he possesseth", if it does not also make the claim that the Christian man shall invest his property as a sacred duty, that God may get His own with interest. That is what probably nine-tenths of our present investors never think of. The good man is he who uses his dividend when got for religious and philanthropic purposes. Till the world realizes that responsibility lies on the other side of investment, that the function of wealth-getting, whether discharged through the impersonal method of companies or through the direct action of the community itself, may involve, no less than "the rich man's contumely", the murder of souls, the Church must cry in the wilderness, its prophets constantly speak the truth, boldly rebuke vice, and—receive a prophet's reward.

[Published for the Pan-Anglican Congress Committees, who alone are responsible for these Papers.]

SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE.

LONDON: NORTHUMBERLAND AVENUE, W.C.

1908.

C 2

PAN-ANGLICAN PAPERS

Being Problems for consideration at the *Pan-Anglican Congress*, 1908.

WHAT IS CHRISTIAN IN SOCIALISM?

By REV. ARNOLD PINCHARD

VICAR OF ST. JUDE'S, BIRMINGHAM

THE form in which this question is put at once presents a certain difficulty. There may be (in fact there is) much in Socialism which is essentially Christian, and yet Socialists may not be prepared to recognize it as such. On the other hand, many Socialists teach doctrines and demand reforms which are not only not Christian, but are positively antagonistic to Christian doctrine and practice.

In answering this question, then, careful distinction must first be made between these ideals and methods of social reform which are proper to Socialism, and those other wild and often pernicious ideas which are adopted by some Socialists and put forward as though they were indeed proper and necessary to the Socialist ideal; as, e.g., any interference with the Marriage Bond—the destruction of the “Home” for children and parents; or the denial of the possibility of any right of private property under Socialism! Such ideas as these are not in any way essential or proper to Socialism, and must be resolutely disregarded.

Then, in the second place, it must be remembered that certain ideas or methods of social reform may be in perfect accord with Christian ideals and doctrines, and yet those who advocate them may be quite unaware of the fact; may refuse to recognize it; or may even declare that they have derived their ideas and principles from other than Christian sources. Yet this does not alter the fact that their ideas and principles may be essentially Christian in this sense: viz., that they are in exact accord with the ideals and principles which Christians (theoretically at least) acknowledge to be binding upon themselves, and which are formally applied by them in the higher life of things spiritual, though they may be flagrantly ignored by these same Christians in things temporal. And thus it comes about that we see the Banner of Christ in the hands of the Socialists, and find them demanding the application of Christian methods and principles to political and economic reform:—a demand the propriety of which all Christians ought readily to admit. For we cannot allow that there may be one Law of Righteousness applicable to things spiritual and another to things temporal and material.

The Socialists lay down certain principles which they maintain ought to govern the social and economic relations of men in things temporal, and these they believe would make for the peace, welfare, and happiness of mankind. They also believe that these principles can be secured in a practical manner only by the adoption of a certain definite system of economic and social reform.

The fact from which Socialism derives its impetus and inspiration

is the fact of the Universal Brotherhood of Man. The moral obligation, which Socialism recognizes as derived from that fact, and as being of universal obligation (and therefore applicable to all circumstances and conditions of human life and relation), may be expressed in the words of our Lord Himself, Who said, "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself!"—and—"Love is the fulfilling of the Law".

This moral obligation requires for its realization the practical recognition of the principle of Justice and of Equality of Opportunity for all men, and the Socialists contend that this equality can only be had by a complete revolution of our social and economic system. They demand as a preliminary necessity that all those things which belong to the necessities of life should be freely accessible to all men without distinction and without strife.

They declare that Co-operation must take the place of Competition: that for every man there must be Equality of Opportunity: that every man is bound to contribute by work to the general good: and they further assert that these results can only be attained by the Collective Ownership of all Capital, of the Means of Production, and of the Land. This is their contention in the sphere of politics and economics.

Now on examination it will be seen that the Church accepts and applies these ideals and principles in the sphere of things spiritual.

Her first and last rule in the regulation of the relations between man and man in the Spiritual Kingdom is "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself"; and She allows no man to take advantage of his neighbour in the use of the necessities of the spiritual life, either by depriving him of his just opportunity or by taking more than is one man's just share.

She secures this by the application of the principle of Collective Ownership in Spiritual Capital and Means of Production.

Her Spiritual capital lies in her possession of Absolute Revealed Truth, of which She is at once the Keeper, Witness, and Teacher: and in Her Supernatural Power of Sacramental Grace which She dispenses as God's Steward, through the hand of Her own appointed ministers and stewards; and this is freely given to all without any distinction of age, sex or rank. Her "plant" is not the monopoly or private property of any man or set of men, and may not lawfully be used for any purposes of private gain. All Her possessions are held in trust for the good and benefit and use of the whole Body, and equally of any member of the Body. Thus She is able to secure Equality of Opportunity for all alike without distinction.

In the Sacrament of Baptism she admits all kinds of persons, kings or beggars, on the same terms and by the same means, to membership in the Kingdom of God; and moreover conveys to each an indefeasible right to the use of all her resources for the maintenance and development of Life: proclaiming in every case the new member to be an "Inheritor of the Kingdom of God".

And this inheritance is a reality. It may be said that every child born into the human family is "Inheritor of all the Ages"—but he will have to enter upon a desperate and fratricidal conflict with his brethren if he is ever to secure anything like his share of the inherit-

ance. But in the Church it is not so ! There is no conflict, no strife, since all things belong equally to each, and the rule of Co-operation obtains instead of the Law of Competition.

Therefore the new member is indeed Inheritor of the Kingdom and of all that the Kingdom has to give. In due course and progress he may take and use, in co-operation and brotherly relation with others, everything necessary to the fullness of the Life that he is to live as a citizen of the Holy City. Everything is his, without strife, without money, and without price ; and on the one condition that he who receives shall in turn contribute by loyalty and service to the general welfare of the Body to which he belongs, in obedience to its laws.

The ministers of the Church are at his service ; the buildings are his own to use at will ; the Sacraments, which are the " necessities of life ", are freely at his disposal. He mingles freely in the corporate and social life of the Body in an atmosphere of interdependence, forbearance, and brotherly love. No one is at a loss by that which each receives, and each in turn contributes to the welfare of all.

Such conditions of Freedom, Equality, and Brotherly Love could only be secured where the necessities of life belong equally to all alike, and are equally shared by all :—in other words, where that which corresponds to what we call in the material sphere Capital and the Means of Production, are collectively owned.

The Church requires and provides for the practical realization of the principle of justice between man and man just as the Socialists ask for it, and on precisely the same ground. Men differ infinitely in their capacities and abilities, but all alike have certain fundamental needs in things material as well as in things spiritual. The Church takes care that ample provision shall be made for the satisfaction of these fundamental spiritual needs equally in all cases ; yet She recognizes that infinite variety of inequality of endowment and capacity is found among men, and expects that some will be able to use the ordinary opportunities and means of life to a much greater degree of profit and success than others : and leaves each man free to profit by these and to develop himself as he may be able, so long as it be without prejudice or injury to his brethren.

It is unnecessary to show how thoroughly the Church endorses in her teaching and practice the (Socialist) Doctrines of Freedom and Brotherly Love. One has only to glance at the Sacrament of the Altar to see there expressed in the strongest practical terms the Doctrine of the Fatherhood of God and of the Brotherhood of man. What the Church teaches there in act, that She impresses upon Her children no less forcibly by precept. And again She understands the true meaning of perfect freedom, and how that it can only be had in the complete submission of the individual to the Law of Love working in and through the Body of which he is a living part. She repudiates and detests that Anarchy, in which is found the essence of selfish individualism, and She demands of each member of the Body obedience to the Law which governs and preserves the Body, and guarantees to the individual himself that perfection of freedom

which he may enjoy in the corporate unity of the Body—the glorious liberty of the Sons of God !

If, then, Socialists demand the Collective Ownership of the means of living—of those things which are fundamentally necessary to life—it is because they believe that by this means alone can be secured that Justice, Equality of Opportunity, and that Freedom for and among men which social morality requires. If they insist, in all social and business relations, upon the subordination of the individual to the corporate interest, it is because they believe that only through and by the Body can the individual ever find his own true good and secure his own best personal advantage. Thus they postulate the substitution of Co-operation for Competition and of Brotherly Love for fratricidal antagonism (of Socialism for individualism) in order to secure the highest possible good for the whole family of man ; and it is seen that they base this demand on moral grounds.

While, then, it is quite true that a Socialist may acknowledge and act upon these moral considerations and yet profess himself to be indifferent to religion or even antagonistic to Christianity ; yet that does not alter the fact, evident at a glance, that Catholic Christianity does at least profess to recognize, in a very exalted and sacrificial sense, the Universal Brotherhood of Man, and also acknowledges itself to be bound by the moral obligation of brotherly love and service which naturally follows from this Truth. Moreover it becomes evident on a little careful scrutiny that all the arrangements and the whole system of the Institutional Church of God are planned and framed in such a manner as to provide for the realization and practical application, in things spiritual, of this Truth and its consequent obligations. And further, it becomes clear that the method, taught by the Holy Ghost, by which the Church secures in Her own realm the practical application of these principles, is none other than the method of the Collective Ownership of all the Capital, Means of Production, and necessities of life which She possesses.

It appears, then, that Socialism may be defined as an endeavour to apply to the political, social, and economic relations of men the same Law of Righteousness, in Love and Justice, which the Church Herself applies to the spiritual sphere : and that there exists a real and true analogy between the methods She employs and those which Socialism advocates, while the moral ground assumed is in each case identical. It will be idle, then, to deny that there is in Socialism so much that is Christian as that no Christian man can afford to ignore its claims or to refuse to them grave and deliberate scrutiny and a consideration which from the outset can hardly fail to arouse both sympathy and respect.

[Published for the Pan-Anglican Congress Committees, who alone are responsible for these Papers.]

SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE:

LONDON : NORTHUMBERLAND AVENUE, W.C.

PAN-ANGLICAN PAPERS

Being Problems for consideration at the *Pan-Anglican Congress*, 1908.

CHRISTIANITY AND SOCIALISM

(a) WHAT IS CHRISTIAN IN SOCIALISM

(b) WHAT IS NOW PRACTICABLE IN SUCH IDEALS

BY THE REV. C. B. WILMER, D.D., ATLANTA, GEORGIA, U.S.A.

THE dictum of Frederick Denison Maurice that "we must either Christianize Socialism or socialize Christianity" has lost none of its force since those memorable words were uttered.

To this result have contributed not only vast industrial changes, and the wide diffusion of education among the working classes, but the religious teachings of the Church itself, individualistic as those teachings have been. It is impossible to awaken in men the consciousness of the value of a single human personality, as of more worth than the whole world of things, without thereby producing, sooner or later, great social consequences.

But, besides this, two notable results of Biblical scholarship have been influential in the same direction. One is the discovery of the Old Testament prophet, with his social message for his age; and the other is the discovery, or recovery, of our Lord's doctrine of the Kingdom of Heaven, as an ideal social state, to be progressively realized upon earth, in accordance with the Will of God.

In order to discuss the relation of Christianity to Socialism, it is obviously necessary to institute two fundamental inquiries: first, what is Socialism? and, secondly, what is Christianity?

I. WHAT IS SOCIALISM?

The word Socialism is employed in two distinct yet related senses. In a broad sense, Socialism is contrasted with Individualism. Says Bishop Westcott, "Individualism regards humanity as made up of disconnected and warring atoms. Socialism regards it as an organic whole. . . . The aim of socialism is the fulfilment of service; the aim of individualism is the attainment of some personal advantage—riches, place or fame. Socialism seeks such an organism as shall secure for every one the completest development of his powers; individualism seeks primarily the satisfaction of the particular wants of each one, in the hope that the pursuit of private interests will, in the end, secure public welfare."

But as ordinarily employed, Socialism, while including the general view of human society as given by Bishop Westcott, stands also for a definite economic programme. It is true that the word has undergone changes of signification and has been connected, more or less, with the doctrines of atheism, materialism, so-called "free-love",

and the like. It is associated, in the popular mind, with anarchy, and often identified with communism and the total abolition of the right of private property. But the scientific student of Socialism will endeavour to free it from the personal vagaries of individual socialists, and try to get at what is essential in the scheme. No Christian is willing that all the sins of Churchmen should be laid at the door of Christ, or that any system of theology should be taken as the final statement of what is essential Christianity. We must be as just towards Socialism as we desire Socialists to be toward us. Socialism, as now understood, has no necessary connexion with materialism, atheism, or the abolition of the family. It is even claimed by many socialists, and with a good deal of force, that the present competitive system is undermining the family, by forcing mothers and children into the ranks of outside labourers; and that only under a system which enables the head of the house to support his wife and children can the family be placed on a sound and enduring basis. Further, Socialism is the bitter foe of anarchy; and it is not to be identified with communism, or a scheme of dividing up all property among individuals, to be followed by a reconstitution of the old order. Its advocates are not criminals and beggars, but include men of the highest type in business, science and religion. Accepting the definition of Professor Ely's *Socialism and Social Reform*, Socialism contains four essential elements:

I. The Common Ownership of the Material Instruments of Production; that is, land and capital; all that part of wealth which is used in production as distinguished from that which is merely enjoyed in the use. Private property is abolished to the extent that interest, rent and profits, which now go to the private owners of money, land and capital, will go to the State, the people as a whole, the collective owners of the instruments of wealth-creation.

II. The second element in Socialism is Common Management of the instruments of production; and for the benefit of the people as a whole. It substitutes "production for use" in place of "production for private profit". Under this régime, employment is furnished for all able to work; and all able to work *must* work. There are to be no idle classes except the disabled or unable; no tramps or idle multimillionaires.

III. The third element is the Distribution of Income by Common Authority among all the workers.

IV. The fourth element is Private Property in "the larger proportion of income". Socialism, then, does not undertake the abolition of private property. On the contrary, "Socialism asserts that society, as at present constituted, is unable to secure to each one the private property which he requires. Socialism proposes to extend the institution of private property in such manner as to secure to each individual in society property in annual income, which shall be, so far as practicable, sufficient to satisfy all rational wants, and to protect all from those attacks upon personal freedom which proceed from the dependence of man upon man. . . . Now while private

property in the instruments of production is to be reduced to its lowest terms, it is to be extended and strengthened in the products for the sake of which the instruments exist."

Putting these four elements together, we have the following definition of Socialism: "Socialism is that contemplated system of industrial society which proposes the abolition of private property in the great material instruments of production, and the substitution therefor of collective property; and advocates the collective management of production, together with the distribution of social income by society, and private property in the larger proportion of this income".

II. WHAT IS CHRISTIANITY?

Such, in bare and suggestive outline, is Socialism; what, now, is Christianity? There are, of course, various answers to this question; but, fortunately, we need consider Christianity only in so far as our answer affects its sociological relations.

One interpretation of Christianity, indeed, must be decidedly rejected; the individualistic interpretation, according to which the purpose of Christianity is to prepare separate souls for the hereafter. The Gospel proclaimed by Christ was not a scheme of individual salvation, but was the good news of the Kingdom of God as at hand; a kingdom begun in this world and having as its mission to get God's will done on earth as in heaven, in the secular as in the spiritual realm; to get the Spirit of God into all human life, somatic, psychic and pneumatic, embracing politics, business, art, literature, in short, the whole of human life. Nothing less than that can be the aim of the Religion of the Incarnation, "The Word become flesh"; within no narrower bounds may we contract the sympathies of the Son of Man.

It is perfectly true and ought never to be forgotten that this kingdom begun here, stretches on into the beyond. The "gates of death shall not prevail" against it; but, on the contrary, through the grave and gateway of death, it shall pass to its highest stage, when this mortal shall have put on immortality and death been swallowed up in life. It is to Christian Hope alone that the apostrophe of the poet may rightly be addressed:

Eternal hope! When yonder spheres sublime
Pealed their first notes to sound the march of time,
Thy joyous youth began, but not to fade;
When all the sister planets have decayed,
When, wrapped in fire, the realms of ether glow,
And heaven's last thunder shakes the world below,
Thou, undismayed, shalt o'er the ruins smile,
And light thy torch at nature's funeral pile.

But such an end is result rather than purpose. Heaven as an eternal state is to be attained only by striving to bring heaven upon earth.

Christ eternalized the Old Testament of the Kingdom of God, spiritualizing alike its processes and its aim; but He never got away from the Old Testament thought of labouring for the good of humanity

upon earth. The working hypothesis of Christianity is that "The kingdom of this world" is to "become the kingdom of our God and of His Christ".

It must be noticed also that the Kingdom of God which is progressively to be realized on earth is an ideal *social* state. The Kingdom is a fellowship, a brotherhood. It does not contemplate any good that cannot be shared with others. Christianity assumes as the two fundamental facts about the constitution of human nature, its two wants which condition all others, that man is, in the first place, a religious being and must needs have a God to worship; and, in the second place, man is a social being and must realize himself in fellowship. Its philosophy of fellowship is that man, in joining himself with others in human society, does not give up anything essential to his development, but, on the contrary, finds in a rightly constructed society the truth that makes him free. Christianity is the religion of love, and love means fellowship. The quality and range of a man's love fixes his own place in the scale of being.

Another distinctive feature of this fellowship, as of the government of God in its final stage, is the reign of the Spirit. "The kingdom of God is righteousness, peace and joy—in the Spirit." There is no compulsion, no government by external law; but all is spontaneous, joyous, free.

From this results a most important characteristic of the kingdom, and one which has important bearings on the relation of Christianity to Socialism. The brotherhood realized in the Kingdom of God on earth is not the brotherhood of man as such; it is the brotherhood of the regenerate, the "twice-born". Man is by nature the child of God, but man by nature does not know himself as the child of God; and the process of coming to that consciousness is precisely the process of regeneration, effected by the Holy Spirit, given to those who have faith in the Crucified, Risen, and Ascended Son of God. The Christian is to love all men, so far as they will let him, but fellowship is limited by that which is held in common; and the love of the brethren, the appreciation of this spiritual tie binding Christians together, is made one of the tests of having passed from death to life (John iii. 14). "Whosoever doeth the will of God, the same is my mother and sister and brother" is the law of the Christian's higher human relationships; and, whatever people's individual opinions may be, there is no manner of doubt that by "doing the will of God" our Lord means no external obedience to the moral law, but that spontaneous and inward obedience which is the result of a heart regenerated by the Holy Spirit, as a tree brings forth fruit by the sap which is its life (Matt. vii. 18). The family, or kingdom, of God is the family of the regenerate. All other men are members of the kingdom only *in posse*, not *in esse*. "Except a man be born anew, of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of Heaven." Furthermore, "My kingdom is not of this world."

III. CHRISTIANITY AND CIVIL SOCIETY

Therefore, before we come to speak of Socialism as a particular economic form which is proposed for human society in connexion with Christianity, it is necessary to note the fact of the difference between the Kingdom our Lord came to establish and any form of society whatsoever, into which one enters by the mere fact of physical birth, and from which he departs by the mere fact of physical death. It is perfectly obvious that no such society can be identified with Christianity throughout the whole content of the latter; and the establishment of any social order, as such, cannot be put before Christianity as its goal. The most that can be said of any economic programme is that it would result from the reign of the spirit of Christ, as its outer expression, its sacramental form, the "outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace".

This will become still more plain to us if we reflect on the words of Christ, "a man's life consisteth not in the abundance of things which he possesseth". Now the production and distribution of the things which one may possess is precisely what fills the programme of economics as such. Man's true life, however, is within. It consisteth in what man is, not in what he has. The fact that our Lord uttered these words in connexion with the request made of Him to interfere in a question of the division of property makes their meaning and application still more clear and relevant.

The position that the Church must take in its attitude toward Socialism, or any similar programme, is the same as that Christ took toward this young man: "Who made me a judge or divider over you? Take heed and beware of covetousness." The Church, as such, has no capacity to decide the ethical and scientific questions raised by Socialism, so far as these relate to the production and distribution of wealth; nor has it any warrant to enforce such decision by governmental methods. And its mission must always include the warning of the whole human race against covetousness. It must refuse to be the partisan either of labourer or capitalist, in order that it may be friend and saviour of both. The Church, like her Lord, must resist the temptation to substitute a material for a spiritual kingdom; and she may, like her Lord, have to suffer rejection on that account.

But this is not the whole story. It is the mission of the Church to teach her children that they must, in their individual relations, practise justice. It is also her mission to teach them to establish social justice; justice in the social system as well as justice in the individual. There is a social order, as well as a personal character, which is in accordance with the Will of God. It must be the business of somebody to find out what that is and to bring it about. The Church must furnish the needed inspiration for that great service.

The inability of the Church to say what economic form that social justice shall take does not warrant her in neglecting to insist that it shall take some form.

The Church is bound to take note of social justice for another reason. While she must, at all hazards, hold to the capacity of men, by the aid of Divine grace, to resist temptation and rise superior to circumstances, yet she must not fail to recognize what hitherto she largely has failed to recognize, that for many people and especially for children a bad environment is too strong for the due assertion of personality. It is a one-sided view of Christianity which leads us to expect pure family life to come out of conditions which make privacy impossible; or useful citizens and good men out of sweat shops, with bad physical and moral atmosphere and too many hours of work per day. The prayer our Lord taught His disciples to pray not only bases the worship of God upon the brotherhood of man, but teaches that a complete work for man must have regard both to the external conditions of life, and also to the internal condition. "Lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil." "Lead us not into temptation"—this, in its broadest sense, is the prayer of humanity, accompanying the effort, to arrive at a satisfactory set of external conditions; "but deliver us from evil"—this is the prayer that, where external conditions may not be made satisfactory, we may by the grace of God be delivered by victory over those very conditions from the only real evil, which is sin. It is the mission of social science to aim at the first petition's fulfilment; as it is the aim of the Church to accomplish the second.

IV. WHAT IS CHRISTIAN IN SOCIALISM

From this view of the relation of Christianity to civil society in general, we pass to the consideration of its relation to Socialism, as a particular social order.

It results from what has been said that, if we view Socialism merely as a certain division of this world's goods, it is either non-Christian, or positively un-Christian; although not any more so than any other social order similarly viewed. But if we regard Socialism as the attempted embodiment of the brotherhood of man, founded on human rights and especially on human duties manward, it must be said:

First, Christianity cannot be committed to it, or to any other social programme, unless it can be shown, that it is (a) consistent with the rights of all men; (b) that it is practicable; (c) that it will develop better men according to the Christian ideal than that social order for which it is to be substituted. Now it is obvious that the determination of these questions is partly scientific, and only partly Christian. When our Lord took, as He did, toward human society, a certain attitude of aloofness, He thereby intended, not to divorce the Kingdom of God utterly from all connexion with human society, but to leave to human liberty and human thought and experience—in a word, to human science—the determination of what social order is best. He was rendering unto Caesar what is Caesar's.

There is, therefore, a large realm left here for difference of economic

opinion, even among the strongest and most devout believers in the brotherhood of man ; just as there is room for difference of opinion among the advocates of temperance as to the best method of attacking, from the point of view of society, the admitted evils of the liquor traffic.

It appears to the present writer, therefore, that the question, What is Christian in Socialism, does not admit of a definite answer in all respects, because of the difficulty of answering some of the economic questions involved—questions which cannot be answered from the Christian point of view alone.

It will make this more plain if we pass under review some of the arguments, both moral and economic, which are adduced on behalf of Socialism, and also glance at replies which have been suggested.

ARGUMENTS FOR SOCIALISM

It is contended by Socialists that their system will, in the first place, do away with the inevitable waste of the present competitive régime. For example, (1) it is estimated by Professor Ely that the effort by rivals to parallel a certain railway system in the United States, leading to consolidation, caused a waste of a sum of money sufficient to have builded comfortable homes for two hundred thousand families of five each, or one million persons. Next, (2) the present system of largely planless and competitive production results in either over or under production and consequent waste or want ; and this would be prevented by the unification of production. (3) Socialism would render impossible the prevalent periodical industrial depressions. (4) Under Socialism there would be full utilization, for the benefit of society as a whole, of all those inventions which at present are bought up and suppressed by capitalists ; and there would be a corresponding stimulation of those inventions calculated to shift upon machinery much disagreeable work now done by hand, and to relieve which relatively little has yet been done. For instance, vast improvements have been made in ocean steamship travel, but it practically all goes to the comfort of passengers and little or none of it for the benefit of stokers and sailors. (5) The forces which now work so often to diminish a product, as of cotton or steel, in order to put up prices, with the inevitable result that humanity is deprived of just so much needed goods, would under Socialism work for an enlarged output, with a corresponding benefit to the human family. (6) Some further advantages claimed for the system are : an enrichment of human life from the opportunities that would be given to the poor genius to cultivate his talent ; a relief of the professions from over crowding, consequent upon the making of other occupations more agreeable ; the deliverance of human society from the two extremes of idle poor and idle rich ; the change from private luxury and public parsimony to private simplicity of life and public luxury ; and above all, the advantages accruing from the general spirit of justice that would pervade all life, and from the spirit of service substituted for personal gain as the ruling motive in life.

Many of these claims are admitted by non-socialists. It is objected,

however, on the other hand, that Socialism would destroy personal liberty, the individual being lost in the total machine; that the domination of the whole of society by the one principle of industrialism would work manifold industrial and moral harm; that dissatisfaction, which is now scattered and directed against a number of agents, would be concentrated upon the Government, with the result that there must be either constant revolution or a general break up and the re-establishment of the competitive system; that Socialism as industrial democracy would partake of the weaknesses of democracy in general, among these weaknesses being over-appreciation of some services and under-appreciation of others; and finally, that the whole scheme is impracticable, from the impossibility of the total unification of all production, especially in the case of agriculture, and from the lack of adequate motives for service.

In reply to some of these criticisms it may, indeed, be urged that personal liberty is in a fair way of being destroyed any way; that the determination by society as a whole of the place in which each man is to serve his fellows is no more subversive of personal liberty than the necessity which is forced so often upon men now of choosing between doing uncongenial work on insufficient wages and going to the poor-house; that the determination by society of the place in which one is to work is, theoretically at least, not necessarily incompatible with personal liberty, understanding by that phrase the opportunity given one to use his talents to the best advantage and to find his place in the social order; that the organization society upon the basis of unified industries is not necessarily the domination of society by materialism, any more than the same is true of the present organization of society, men being free in the one case as in the other to subordinate lower to higher values in life; indeed, the certainty of a livelihood under socialism might operate to set free the higher activities of life; and to the objection that the concentration of dissatisfaction would operate to the disadvantage of the Government, it might with equal plausibility and something more be argued that such concentration would operate for the relief from burdens now unescapable. It might be better to have one big hornet to fight instead of numberless little ones, as at present.

So much for the economic view of the subject, apart from Christianity. When we come to view the subject in the light of Christianity, we are struck with the plea that is so generally made, that men are not good enough for Socialism. It ought to be noted that such an objection implies a favourable ethical view of Socialism, and thereby also makes a distinct challenge to the Church.

If the business of Christianity is not to make men good enough for that or anything else, what is our business? What are we here for? When Professor Wagner said to the Socialists, "Your system would require men to be angels," and the Socialists replied that Socialism would make them angels, his reply is undoubtedly to be rejected; but did not the Professor's objection involve a fatal admission? If Socialism would require men to be angels, or, at least,

good, unselfish men, then the only conclusion to be drawn is that Socialism is Christian; and we should labour for its adoption as soon as possible. Whatever may or may not be Christian in Socialism, the assumption that men are to be thought of as always under the sway of the most sordid motives is to be decidedly rejected; and Socialism is to be commended for at least holding up before men's minds an ideal state.

In so far as Socialism aims at the establishment on this earth of a social state which is the practicable embodiment of fraternity, and in so far as it assumes that men need not always be selfish and mean, it is Christian. Socialism, again, is alike scientific and Christian in that it holds to the view which has been already expressed in the quotation above from Bishop Westcott, that human society is an organism, not a collection of warring atoms. It is, indeed, an organism "of which each separate cell is conscious"; but it is an organism for all that. When the question of personal liberty of the individual is under discussion, it is too often, perhaps generally, forgotten that individuality is not individualism; and that individuality is not only not inconsistent with filling one's place in corporate society, but is inseparable therefrom. As every leaf on an oak tree differs from every other leaf, and yet is an oak leaf, and is an oak leaf only by virtue of its fellowship along with the other leaves in the equal participation in the corporate life of the tree, so it is with human life. Every man should have full development of both personality and individuality; should be both personal by virtue of those qualities which are common to all men as such; and also individual, developing those qualities by virtue of which he differs from all other men. But this is possible only as each man remains a member of society and finds his true place, the place of service, in that society. And such service is freedom, conformity to the truth of being. Whether or not society as a whole is the best agent for determining the individual's place of service is open to question; but the idea itself, if it could be carried out, is Christian.

And it is also scientific. The old idea of government, as limited in its true sphere to letting each man alone as long as he pursues his own ends and interferes with no one else, is discredited in both theory and practice. We have already abandoned it in the matter of public education and in other things; and it may be safely asserted that "the pursuit of each man of his own private ends" has not resulted, and in the nature of the case cannot result, in the largest measure of common welfare. There must be social management of social affairs, no matter where the delimitations of "social affairs" may be conceived rightfully to be.

In the next place, Socialism is Christian in so far as it advocates the making of shoes, for example, for people instead of for profit. The individual shoe manufacturer may, under the present régime, be Christian though making shoes for profit, on the ground that he is compelled to, and on the further ground that he may hold to the stewardship of the wealth which comes to him through that channel;

but a social system which necessitates, or as a matter of fact constantly involves, lessening the output of shoes while people need shoes, or regards as a "calamity" a large cotton crop, while millions need cotton, must be condemned as inhuman and un-Christian. Socialism must also be commended as Christian in its opposition to the waste that is inseparable from our present system, due to unregulated individualism. If the time shall ever come when the supply of food, for example, has to be carefully guarded in order that there may be bread for all, the waste of any would at once be felt to be wrong and a matter that concerned every one, instead of a matter that concerned only the individual grower of wheat; but waste is none the less wrong in principle now; and any social system that involves inevitable waste is thereby condemned as un-Christian, and the protest against it is Christian, or at least must be approved by Christian sentiment.

As regards the ownership and control of capital, the question is more difficult. If the collective ownership and management of capital can get better results for all, that would seem to justify such ownership and capital, but that is hypothetical. There may be, however, on the other hand, even under the present system, some evolution of what are now called "trusts" that would do away with or greatly minimize the evils of planless and wasteful competition, and still conserve human rights, being made free from the sin of exacting too great toll from the human race.

But certainly our present social order must be condemned in that it treats labour as a commodity, instead of labourers as human beings; forcing a state of warfare between employers and employed; and giving, oftentimes, wages to young women, for example, that imperil their virtue, and crushing out the life of young children. Socialism is fundamentally Christian in that it puts a supreme value on human life, holding with the Master that a man is better than a sheep, or than profits.

But the question is not so difficult with regard to the monopoly of "natural opportunities", and what is known as "the unearned increment". In the judgement of the present writer, the giving of the "unearned increment" to its rightful owners, because its creators, viz. the people, is the dictate of the most elemental justice; and the monopoly for private gain of natural opportunities necessarily involves human enslavement, direct or indirect, and is contrary to the brotherhood of men.

V. WHAT IS NOW PRACTICABLE IN SUCH IDEALS

The practicability of any social ideals is partly a matter of economic conditions and the evolutionary stage which any particular country has reached; and partly a matter of character. So far as the latter element is concerned, the present imperative duty of the Church would seem to be to stress without delay the general principles of social well-being: the idea of service as the true aim of life; the

duty of social as well as private justice ; the supremacy of the rights of men above the "rights" of mammon ; and the duty that lies upon Christians, as distinguished from the corporate duty of the Church, to strive with some definite programme after the establishment of a better and better social order. The pulpit must lift anew the slogan, "Repent ye, for the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand" ; and we must let men know that they have not repented until they have "changed their minds" so as to labour for the coming of that kingdom.

And while the truth must be held to that that kingdom is something higher than the mere social order considered by itself, and while the highest service that can be rendered a fellow man is to develop the filial consciousness within him, thus bringing him into vital relations with the source of all life, there must be added, as part of the Christian service of his fellow men, the work of getting as much as may be of the principles of justice and love into the social system. Charity is often necessary, but it should more and more give way to enlarged opportunity. Indeed, it is more and more evident that to preach the gospel to the hungry and those brought up in the conditions prevailing in some of our large cities is valueless and even a mockery. God's reign must not be lowered to the temporal order, but it must be made to include it.

As regards remedial legislation, what is practicable of course is different in different countries ; but speaking generally, there would seem to be no reason why a beginning might not be made of the recognition of the fundamental principle of brotherhood on which political economy should be based, the equal rights of all to God's gifts of "natural opportunities". This will include the government regulation at least, and especially the just taxation, of public utility corporations. Indeed, it may be, that before we give up the principle of all private enterprise and competition, we ought to try making the contest a more equal one.

Another thing that might be done is letting the State itself come into competition with private capitalistic enterprise where such is needed. The State, the people in its executive capacity, might say, "Your management has been tried in the balance and found wanting ; do better or we will put a plant alongside yours", just as public education competes with private. The example of New Zealand might be studied with great profit in many of its features.

The problem of the unemployed is one that must, now and then, receive the attention of the State. Why should men thrown out of work become objects of charity ? Why should not the State, if it permits a social system which results in such lack of employment, accept the responsibility and provide for it, at least until it can succeed in establishing some other social order ?

Some other practicable measures are the abolition of sweat shops, sanitary conditions in rented dwellings for the poor, one day's rest in seven, various measures affecting the welfare of women and children, extension of public education to embrace kindergarten for the youngest and such training of older ones as shall look towards self-maintenance ;

government insurance; public employment bureaus; public loan establishments; progressive income tax, along with measures looking to the absorption of "the unearned increment".

CONCLUSION

On a certain Sunday afternoon, the present writer was passing through Boston Common, and stopped to listen to a secularist argue that "if a man was born right the first time, he would not need to be born again". Not far away and almost in hearing was a Salvation Army representative, preaching, no doubt, just the doctrine of being born again which the orator before me was repudiating. The work of the Church must somehow get these two men to see eye to eye. There never will come a time on this earth when it will not be necessary for man to be born anew. "That which is born of the flesh is flesh," and the law of heredity will probably stay with us. Nor will ever an ideal state be established until humanity as a whole is made over again. But, on the other hand, it is incumbent on him who is born anew, it will more and more prove that one has been regenerated, that he will strive individually and through collective action to give to every human being on earth, in the language of President Roosevelt, "a square deal."

[Published for the Pan-Anglican Congress Committees, who alone are responsible for these Papers.]

SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE.

LONDON: NORTHUMBERLAND AVENUE, W.C.

1908.

KING'S COLLEGE

(UNIVERSITY OF LONDON).

The General Education at King's College, London, is conducted in several distinct but connected Faculties and Departments, viz.:—

I. THE FACULTY OF THEOLOGY.

1. *Morning Course.* 2. *Evening Course.*

II. THE FACULTY OF ARTS (including (1) General Literature, Secondary Teachers' Training Course, Day Training College, and Oriental Studies; (2) the Department of Architecture; (3) Division of Laws.) *Day and Evening Classes.*

III. THE FACULTY OF SCIENCE. (1) Natural Science Division (*Day and Evening Classes*); (2) Medical Division (*Preliminary and Intermediate Studies*); (3) Department of Bacteriology; (4) Department of Public Health.

IV. THE FACULTY OF ENGINEERING (including Mechanical, Electrical, and Civil Engineering). *Day and Evening Classes.*

V. THE FACULTY OF MEDICINE (Advanced Medical Studies at King's College Hospital).

VI. THE WOMEN'S DEPARTMENT (at 13 Kensington Square).

VII. KING'S COLLEGE SCHOOL (Wimbledon Common).

VIII. THE CIVIL SERVICE DEPARTMENT.

1. *Day and Evening Classes for the Civil Service.*

2. *Day Classes for Female Appointments in G. P. O.*

IX. STRAND SCHOOL, suitable for Commerce, the Professions, and the Civil Service.

A separate Prospectus is prepared for each of these Faculties and Departments, and will be forwarded on application to

THE SECRETARY, KING'S COLLEGE, STRAND, W.C.

THEOLOGICAL FACULTY.

PRINCIPAL AND DEAN—REV. ARTHUR C. HEADLAM, D.D.

CHAPLAIN—REV. S. C. E. LEGG, M.A.

<i>Dogmatic Theology...</i>	...	...	...	Rev. ARTHUR C. HEADLAM, D.D., Professor.
<i>Lecturer for 1909.</i>	...	...	...	Rev. A. R. WHATELY, D.D.
<i>Exegesis of the New Testament</i>	...	...	...	{ Rev. H. J. WHITE, M.A., Professor.
				{ Rev. S. C. E. LEGG, M.A., Lecturer.
<i>Hebrew and the Exegesis of the Old Testament</i>	...	...	...	{ Rev. A. NAIRNE, M.A., Professor.
				{ Rev. H. F. B. COMPSTON, M.A., Lecturer.
<i>Ecclesiastical History</i>	...	...	...	{ Rev. E. W. WATSON, M.A., Professor.
				{ Rev. G. E. NEWSOM, M.A., Professor.
<i>Pastoral and Liturgical Theology</i>	...	...	...	{ Rev. CLEMENT F. ROGERS, M.A.
				{ Rev. A. CALDECOTT, D.D., D.Lit. (Lond.),
<i>Mental and Moral Philosophy</i>	...	...	...	{ Professor.
				{ Rev. W. R. MATTHEWS, B.D., Lecturer.
<i>Latin</i>	...	...	...	{ Rev. H. F. B. COMPSTON, M.A., Lecturer.
<i>Economics</i>	...	...	...	{ E. J. URWICK, M.A., Tooke Professor.
<i>Theory and Practice of Vocal Music</i>	...	...	...	{ J. E. VERNHAM, Professor.
<i>Elocution</i>	...	...	...	{ F. J. KIDSON.
<i>Laws of Health and Disease in their Relation to the Ministerial Office</i>	...	...	...	{ W. J. SIMPSON, M.D., F.R.C.P., D.P.H.,
				{ Professor.

Full course for the B.D. (London). The Diploma ('Associate of King's College'), which is awarded upon certain conditions at the end of the 'Two Years' Course, is accepted by most of the Bishops. Five Entrance Exhibitions of £20 a year for two years are offered in October. Bursaries are also given in certain cases.

For Prospectus, apply to THE SECRETARY, KING'S COLLEGE, STRAND, W.C.

CURATES' AUGMENTATION FUND.

The only Society in the Church of England for the
purpose of helping Assistant Curates.

Presidents:

HIS GRACE THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY.

HIS GRACE THE ARCHBISHOP OF YORK.

Treasurer:

REV. T. A. SEDGWICK.

This Society augments the stipends of Curates who have been more than 15 years in Holy Orders, and are still in full active work.

Of the 7,000 Curates very many have been ordained more than 15 years, and this number is annually increasing.

It is the only Society in England that directly increases the Stipends of Curates of long standing. It is one of the best Societies in the country, and one most needed. The 'QUEEN VICTORIA CLERGY FUND' does not help the Unbeneficed Clergy.

The Church is multiplying Curates three times as rapidly as she is multiplying Benefices.

Upwards of £9,400 was voted last year in Grants.

The average stipend of those receiving Grants does not exceed £3 a week.

**CHURCH COLLECTIONS, SUBSCRIPTIONS, AND DONATIONS
THANKFULLY RECEIVED.**

Cheques, P.O.O., and Postal Orders, crossed 'COUTTS & Co.' should be sent to the
OFFICE: 2 DEAN'S YARD, WESTMINSTER. S.W.

Rev. A. G. B. ATKINSON, *Secretary*.

The Central Church Committee for Defence and Instruction.

Chairman—The Lord ASHCOMBE.

The Committee, as the body specially charged with the duty of spreading a sound knowledge of the origin, history, and work of the Church, and of organizing in defence of her secular interests, earnestly appeal for

SUBSCRIPTIONS, DONATIONS, AND OFFERTORIES

to enable them adequately to comply with the demands made upon them throughout the country for Speakers, Organizers, Lecturers, Publications, Advice and Information, &c., in connection with the Education and Dis-establishment controversies.

ADDITIONAL FUNDS

for these purposes are much needed, and CONTRIBUTIONS, of whatever amount, will be most thankfully received by the Bankers, Messrs. HOARE AND CO., 37 Fleet Street, E.C.; or by

T. MARTIN TILBY, *Secretary*.

Offices: Church House, Westminster, S.W.



BX 5021 P36 1908 v.2 TRIN
Pan-Anglican Congress
Pan-Anglican Congress, 1908

DATE	ISSUED TO

BX 5021 P36 1908 v.2 TRIN
Pan-Anglican Congress
Pan-Anglican Congress, 1908

